

TARTU STATE UNIVERSITY



Some  
Typical Mistakes  
Occurring in Our  
Students' Written  
Papers

by  
L. Hone

II

TARTU  1971

TARTU STATE UNIVERSITY

Chair of English

Some  
Typical Mistakes  
Occurring in Our  
Students' Written  
Papers

by  
L. Hone

**И. Хоун**  
**ТЯЖЕЛЫЕ ОШИБКИ**  
**В ПИСЬМЕННЫХ РАБОТАХ СТУДЕНТОВ**  
**Часть вторая**  
**На английском и эстонском языках**  
**Тартуский государственный университет**  
**СССР, г. Тарту, ул. Пиймооли, 18**

Vastutav toimetaja H. Laan  
TRÜ retsprint 1971. Paljundamiseks antud 9.VI 1971.  
Trükipõõgnaid 10. Tingtrükipõõgnaid 9,3. Arvestus-  
põõgnaid 6,9. Trükiarv 600. Paber 30x42. 1/4.  
Tell. nr. 528.  
Hind 35 kop.

# CONTENTS

	Page
Preface .....	5
The Adjective .....	8
The Adverb .....	20
Adverbs of manner .....	20
Adverbs of degree .....	24
Adverbs of time .....	31
Adverbs of place .....	40
The Preposition .....	43
Prepositions with certain adverbial modifiers and attributes .....	43
Verbs calling for certain prepositions .....	53
Nouns used with certain prepositions .....	59
Adjectives requiring certain prepositions ..	67
Prepositions indicating time and direction .	71
Synonymous prepositions .....	81
Verbs used in different constructions .....	86
Synonymous verbs calling for different prepo- sitions .....	104
Noun and verb with different prepositions ..	111
Nouns used with different prepositions ....	115
Unpopular prepositional constructions .....	120



	Page
Particles and Conjunctions .....	128
Particles .....	128
Conjunctions .....	130
Copulative conjunctions .....	130
Conjunctions of time and comparison ...	137
Consecutive conjunctions .....	141
Conjunctions of cause and reason .....	143
Conjunctions of concession .....	145
Indexes .....	150
Sources used .....	160

## P R E F A C E

The present booklet is a sequel to "Some Typical Mistakes Occurring in Our Students' Written Papers". which appeared a few years ago, and it deals mainly with those parts of speech which were not discussed in Part I. The manuscript was originally compiled as a series of radio lectures and, although the text has been carefully revised this is inevitably reflected in its style and composition.

Some of the points made concern downright mistakes. Others bear upon constructions which are not entirely wrong, but which are unidiomatic or rare, and should be used only in certain special cases.

Every student should constantly remind himself of the fact that in English, as in every other language - perhaps more than in most of them - there are things which nearly everybody says, things which only a few people say and things which no native speaker would ever dream of saying. Consequently, if we want to develop the "feel" of modern spoken English, our primary task is to learn to use the expressions which the vast majority of English people use. We should be chary of repeating things which only a few people might say, and we should certainly try to avoid saying things which no native speaker would ever dream

of saying.

As will be seen, some of the mistakes and unidiomatic constructions discussed here are connected with words and expressions which occur very often, whereas others are much more rare. But in a certain sense all of them can be regarded as sources of typical mistakes. However seldom they may occur, they are almost invariably used wrongly. Of course, one might argue that no great harm is done if once in a while some less orthodox construction slips into a person's speech. That is true enough; but unfortunately experience tells us that the language of students who are unwilling to bother about such 'trifles' usually contains a rather high concentration of out-of-the-way expressions, with the result that their style is either formal, pedantic and old-fashioned, or slangy and slipshod. More often than not it degenerates into a ridiculous mixture of the two, which is much worse; and there is always the danger of being misunderstood. That is why it is advisable to stick to the current usage of the majority of native speakers, and leave the uncommon constructions for those who are able to appreciate their stylistic colouring and make judicious use of them when they are really called for. This should be borne in mind by every student, especially those who wish to become teachers and some day pass on their knowledge to others. But it is of no smaller importance to those who intend to go in for interpreting or translating, since the primary prerequisites for adequate

translation are a full and exact understanding of the foreign context, and the ability to express fully and naturally what one has to say.

To make the book easier to handle it has been provided with an index giving the numbers of all the paragraphs in which a certain word or grammatical point is discussed or mentioned.



## THE ADJECTIVE

There are a number of English adjectives which are sources of frequent mistakes for Estonians.

### 1. 'Little' and 'small'

First of all let us take the adjectives 'little' and 'small'. Here we should remember that in the function of a predicative only 'small' is possible in normal educated speech. Thus we may say:

A little boy came into the room (the word 'little' is here an attribute);

but: The boy is very small for his age (where the word 'small' is a predicative).

The same holds good for predicatives following other link-verbs:

We watched the ship till it became quite small and finally disappeared from sight.

The stars look small, but really they are much larger than the Earth

As attributes both 'little' and 'small' can be used, but stylistically they are by no means equivalent. When size is meant, 'small' is the neutral word, indicating merely that the person or thing in question is not big:

Mr. Brown was a small grey-haired man.

or: Dinny lived in a small cottage near the river.

The word 'little', however, has an emotional colouring which implies that, besides being small, the person or thing in question is nice or pleasant, and that the speaker likes it. Thus, in the sentences

Mr. Brown was a little grey-haired man,

and Dinny lived in a little cottage near the river,

we are not only conscious of the idea of mere physical

smallness or diminutive size, but we also feel that the speaker sympathises with or is somehow attracted to what he is speaking about. This does not mean, however, that by using the word 'small' we necessarily imply that our attitude is unfavourable. It may be either favourable or the reverse, only we are not concerned with this aspect of the question just at the moment, being only interested in the question of size.

For some reason Estonians seem to prefer the word 'little', thus often making their sentences unnecessarily emotional. Of course, it is sometimes rather difficult to say exactly what the author's intention is in a given case, but if the idea we wish to convey is clearly a critical or unfavourable one, the word 'little' is usually out of place. E.g. it is inadvisable to say:

I detest little boys who are always up to mischief,  
or: Dinny lived in a tumbledown little shack in the  
worst of slums.

In such cases the word 'little' softens the mood of condemnation and carries with it a redeeming, almost endearing note, which counteracts, if it does not flatly contradict the basic attitude of disapproval. The only correct alternative here is to use the more neutral word 'small':

I detest small boys who are always up to mischief,  
and Dinny lived in a small, tumbledown shack in the  
worst of slums.

Note, too, the change in the word order. 'Little' should always immediately precede the noun; whereas 'small' (followed by a comma) may be the first of a series of adjectives.

## 2. 'Sick' and 'ill'

Another pair of adjectives which are frequently misused are 'sick' and 'ill' in the meaning of 'unwell', 'not healthy'.

Many students seem to forget that in this sense 'ill' can only be used predicatively:

My friend is ill (mu sõber on haige).

But when we need the attribute, 'sick' is the correct word:

I went to see my sick friend (ma läksin oma haiget sõpra vaatama).

In American English 'sick' is also used as a predicative in the meaning of 'unwell'. Thus in American English our first example might read:

My friend is sick (i.e. mu sõber on haige).

In British usage, however, this would be taken to mean: My friend is overcome with nausea, or is vomiting (mu sõbral on parajasti süda paha).

True, in a more literary style, the word 'ill' can also be used as an attribute, but in this case it is to be understood in the meaning of 'bad', i.e. as the opposite of 'good', not of 'healthy' or 'well'. Thus in formal speech we can speak about 'ill health' (halb tervis), 'ill news' (halb uudised), 'ill luck' (ebaõnn), 'ill breeding' (halb kasvatus), etc., where in ordinary conversation it would be more natural to say 'bad health', 'bad news', 'bad luck', 'bad breeding', etc. As can be seen from the above-mentioned examples, 'ill' - as an attribute - is employed almost exclusively with abstract nouns. Thus such a combination as 'an ill friend', which so frequently occurs in our students' papers is quite unEnglish and can by no manner of means be regarded as a substitute for 'a bad friend'.

### 3. 'Older - oldest' and 'elder - eldest'

A third pair of words which occasionally give rise to misunderstanding are the two alternative forms of the comparative and superlative degrees of the adjective 'old': 'older', 'oldest' and 'elder', 'eldest'. Most students seem



to remember that 'elder' is only used in speaking about members of one and the same family, whereas 'older' is used in all other cases. But at the same time few of them seem to be aware of the fact that 'elder' can only function as an attribute, and if a predicative is needed it should always be 'older', even when we are referring to members of the same family. Thus we should say:

My elder brother's name is Tom,

but: My brother is older than I am,

and: Her eldest sister is a student,

but: There are quite a lot of children in the family.

Which of them is the oldest?

#### 4. The comparative and superlative without comparison.

Another frequent mistake made by Estonians concerns the use of comparative and superlative degrees in sentences where we do not really compare anything at all. This is sometimes done in a rather indefinite way in Estonian. But we must bear in mind that in English it must always be quite clear precisely what persons or objects are compared. If this is not understood from what has been said or written previously it must be fully expressed. Thus in Estonian there is no harm in saying:

Ta oli intelligentsemat sorti noormees.

This might be rendered in English as:

He was a young man of the more intelligent type.

But we certainly cannot say

He was a more intelligent sort of young man

or simply

He was a more intelligent young man

without indicating precisely with whom he is to be compared. In such cases we should add something in order to make the comparison explicit, e.g.:



He was a more intelligent sort of young man than you usually come across nowadays;

or He was more intelligent than most young men of the same age, etc.

Or take the simple Estonian sentence "See näib olevat kõige parem raamat". This cannot simply be translated as "This seems to be the best book". Here the question arises: the best among what kind of books? Consequently we should say "This seems to be the best of my books", or "the best book I have ever read", or "the best book for you", or something of the sort. At any rate, we should add something to render the idea of comparison or selection explicit and complete.

If there is no intention of conveying the idea of comparison at all, we should avoid the superlative degree, and look for some other way of expressing a high degree of the quality in question. In the present case we might say, for instance:

This seems to be a very good book.

In the case of those adjectives which form their degrees of comparison regularly, we can express the same idea by using the word 'most' preceded by the indefinite article. This, as we know, is not a degree of comparison at all. For example, such a sentence as "This is a most simple question" can be translated into Estonian in two ways:

either See on kõige lihtsam küsimus,

or: See on ülilihtne (üsna lihtne, väga lihtne, etc.) küsimus.

Of course, the preceding example might also be rendered into Estonian "See on ülhea raamat", etc. But since the adjective 'good' forms its degrees of comparison irregularly, we could not say in English 'a most good book'.

Much the same is true of the Estonian expressions "on ülim aeg" ja "kõige lähemas tulevikus", which cannot be

treated as the superlative degrees of "ülem aeg" and "lähedane tulevik". It would be bad English to say "it is the highest time", or "in the nearest future", and it would be better to use the expressions "it is high time" and "in the very near future" or "in the immediate future":

It's already past nine. It is high time the children went to bed.

The results of the elections will be made public in the very near future (or: in the immediate future).

From the foregoing we can conclude that in Estonian the degrees of comparison are considerably freer and broader in their application than they are in English. On the other hand the Estonian comparative degree is used quite often in the meaning of the superlative. Thus quite a number of people are in the habit of saying:

Peeter on mu parem sõber;

or: Tom võttis lahkudes kaasa raha ja paremad riided.

Betty ja Mary on meie küla ilusamad neiud.

In English such sentences invariably require the superlative degree:

Peter is my best friend.

Tom left, taking with him all his money and his best clothes.

Betty and Mary are the prettiest girls in the village.

Occasionally we find an Estonian comparative with the force of a simple positive degree, as for example in the colloquial phrase:

See pole suurem asi.

In English this would have to be translated as

It isn't up to much,

It's not too hot,

Nothing special.

5. 'Due to', 'because of', 'owing to', etc.

Another rather difficult point which requires notice concerns the use of the phrase 'due to' to express cause. Here it is important to remember that in standard formal English 'due to' can be applied in this sense only as a predicative:

Most of the student's mistakes were due to carelessness (Enamik üliõpilase vigadest olid põhjustatud (olid tingitud) hooletusest).

What was his illness due to? (in Estonian: Millest oli tema haigus põhjustatud?)

But when cause is expressed by any adverbial modifier 'due to' is felt to be out of place, and we should prefer the prepositional phrases: 'because of', 'owing to' or 'on account of':

The train was late owing to (or: because of) an accident (Rong hilines õnnetuse tõttu).

I was absent from the meeting because of illness (Puudusin koosolekult haiguse tõttu).

The new model is particularly suited for tourists on account of its small size (Uus (fotoaparaadi vms.) mudel on eriti sobiv turistidele oma väikese formaadi tõttu).

In cases where the adverbial modifier of cause stands at the head of the sentence, the correct forms are 'owing to', or in a positive sense 'thanks to':

Owing to (or: Thanks to) the kind assistance of our neighbours we soon settled down in our new home (Naabrite lahke abi tõttu, or: tänu naabrite lahkele abile seatsime end oma uues kodus varsti sisse).

Owing to a change in the weather the plane could not take off and all flights were cancelled (Ilma muutuse tõttu lennuk ei saanud õhku tõusta ja lennud jäid ära).



However, we must admit that the free usage characteristic of the Estonian language frequently also occurs in uneducated English speech, perhaps less in England than in the United States.

#### 6. 'Fool' or 'foolish'?

Some students muddle up the noun 'fool' and the adjective 'foolish', and tend to use the noun as an adjective. This can probably be explained by the fact that in Estonian the words 'rumal', 'tobe', etc. are used both as nouns and as adjectives. In English also both the noun and the adjective can be used, but the constructions are different. Thus the Estonian sentence "Kuigi me Harryt hoiatasime, oli ta nii rumal, et võttis Jacki nõu kuulda" might be translated into English in the following ways:

1) Although we warned Harry he was such a fool as to heed Jack's advice. (Here we use the noun 'fool' preceded by the adjective 'such' and the indefinite article).

2) Although we warned Harry he was foolish enough to heed Jack's advice. (Here the adjective 'foolish' is followed by the adverb 'enough');

or: 3) Although we warned Harry he was so foolish as to heed Jack's advice. (Here the adjective 'foolish' is preceded by the adverb 'so').

In other words we have three possible constructions: 'such a fool as to', 'foolish enough to' and 'so foolish as to'. A glance at these three constructions will show us that the noun is modified by an article, whereas the adjective is not.

Perhaps we should add that the adverb of degree 'enough', which is normally used to modify an adjective, may occasionally be preceded by a noun. But this construction is much more abrupt and contemptuous than the usual one. Thus we may say either:



He was foolish enough to heed Jack's advice.

or: He was fool enough to heed Jack's advice.

The second, and more emphatic construction can be used with certain other words of a similar type, as e.g.:

Harry was man enough to reject Jack's proposal (Harryl jätkus mehisust Jacki ettepanek tagasi lükata);

or: She was woman enough to understand her companion's feelings. (Ta oli sedavõrd naine, et suutis oma kaaslase tunnetest aru saada);

or: He was soldier enough to take his defeat without a murmur, (Temas oli seevõrra sõdurit, et võtta kaotust nurisemata), etc.

In every case here it would be possible to replace the noun by an adjective, though at the cost of a slight weakening of the effect: 'manly', or 'manlike'; 'womanish' or 'womanly'; 'soldierly' or 'soldierlike'. But perhaps it would be better to avoid the adjectival constructions wherever possible. They are not only weaker and more bookish in character, but involve subtle distinctions which call for a highly developed sense of style. The case with 'fool' and 'foolish' is somewhat different, as both are derogatory words, and it may be necessary to soften the meaning, in which case 'foolish' should be preferred to 'fool'.

## 7. 'Open'

Another stumbling-block is presented by the choice of the correct equivalent for the Estonian adjectives 'lahtine' and 'avatud'. The participial form 'avatud' seems to suggest automatically the parallel form in English and our students frequently use such combinations as 'an opened window', 'an opened door', 'an opened book' etc., blissfully forgetting the existence of the simple adjective 'open', which is precisely what they need here. Thus the normal variants would be:

Mother stood at the open window (Ema seisis avatud

akna juures).

The wind blew in through the open door (Lahtisest uksest puhus tuul sisse).

The girl sat with an open book in front of her (<sup>"</sup>Tüdruk istus lahtine raamat ees).

Of course, the past participle may occasionally be used, but in English it carries a stronger verbal force and always implies a close sequence of events. If this is what is meant we use the participle, not the adjective, and change the construction, for the participle should follow the noun whereas the adjective precedes it. Thus, if we have to translate into English a sentence like "Avatud uks ei läinud enam kinni" we ought to say

The door, once opened, could not be shut again, rather than: The opened door (or: The open door) could not be shut again.

#### 8. Adjectives with link-verbs of being and remaining

Next I should like to draw your attention to certain link-verbs of being and remaining which are modified by an adjective in English, but by an adverb in Estonian. These are the verbs 'feel', 'taste', 'sound', 'smell' and 'stand'. Especially numerous are the mistakes made in connection with the verb 'feel', which occurs much more frequently than the others. Compare, for example, the English and Estonian versions in such sentences as the following:

The girl felt uncomfortable with everybody's eyes on her (Tüdruk tundis end ebamugavasti, kui kõigi pilgud olid temale suunatud);

The young teacher felt quite free in the absence of guests (Kui külalisi polnud, tundis noor õpetaja end päris vabalt).

The student felt good after passing his exam (Pärast eksami sooritamist tundis üliõpilane end hästi);

But 'to feel well' means 'end tervena tundma'. Thus:

I had a headache earlier in the morning, but now I feel quite well (Hommiikul oli mul peavalu, kuid nüüd tunnen end päris tervena).

Eddie couldn't come to the meeting. He said he felt bad (Eddie ei saanud koosolekule tulla. Ta ütles, et tunneb end halvasti).

True, American colloquial usage is somewhat freer in this respect, and "The Macmillan Handbook of English" suggests that such phrases as 'he felt badly' are now also possible in informal speech. But this tendency has not yet been widely adopted in Standard English and is still regarded by many careful British speakers as illiterate or vulgar, so perhaps we should refrain from recommending it to foreign speakers, at least for the time being.

Now let me give you a few examples with other verbs from this group:

This cake tastes good (See tort maitseb hea, or: maitseb hästi);

The water from this well tastes bad (Selle kaevu vesi maitseb halvasti);

Roses smell sweet (Roosid lõhnavad magusasti);

The soup has turned. It smells sour (Supp on muredaks läinud. Tal on hapu lõhn. Or: Ta lõhnab hapult),

His proposal sounds rather nice to me (Tema ettepanek kõlab päris kenasti);

Does this sentence sound correct in English? (Kas see lause kõlab inglise keeles õigesti? or õigena?);

Jenny stood motionless, staring at the man in the doorway (Jenny seisis liikumatul uksel seisvat meest vahtides);

The boy stood proud and erect (Poiss seisis uhkelt ja sirgelt).

#### 9. 'Usual' or 'usually'?

And lastly I must make a brief reference to the words



'usual' and 'usually', which are still too often confused by Estonian students. In comparisons the adverb 'usually' is replaced by the adjective 'usual'. Thus we say:

He usually comes home early. (Tavaliselt tuleb ta vara koju).

But: Yesterday he came home later than usual (not 'later than usually'. Eile ta tuli koju hiljem kui tavaliselt)

Robert was in high spirits as usual (not 'as usually'. Robert oli nagu tavaliselt ulevas meeleolus), etc.



## THE A

## THE ADVERB

### Adverbs of manner

#### 10. 'Hard' or 'hardly'?

A typical mistake for many students to make is to mix up the two adverbs 'hard' and 'hardly'. It is by no means uncommon to find in their papers such sentences as

He worked hardly

or He hit his head hardly against the doorpost

when they evidently wish to express the idea "Ta tõõtas kõvasti" or "Ta lõi pea kõvasti ära vastu uksepiita". Here we have to remember that 'hard' is used both as an adjective and as an adverb ('kõva' and 'kõvasti'), whereas 'hardly' is only an adverb, and has, moreover, a vastly different meaning, that of 'vaevalt', which is almost the exact opposite of 'kõvasti' in the example mentioned above. Thus the correct translation of the two sentences in question would be:

He worked hard;

and He hit his head hard against the doorpost.

#### 11. Adverbs formed from adjectives ending in -ly

In English there are a number of adjectives ending in -ly (friendly, cowardly, kindly, manly, melancholy, lively, lovely, etc.) which are sometimes treated as adverbs on account of their ending. The fact that the word 'kindly' can function both as an adjective and as an adverb corresponding to the adjective 'kind' seems to contribute towards this misunderstanding, e.g.:

He is a good-natured, kindly old man, who always has a friendly word for everyone (Ta on heasüdamlik, lahke vanamees, kellel leidub igauhe jaoks sõbralik

sõna).

But: Will you kindly leave me your address (Kas te oleksite nii lahke ja jätaksite mulle oma aadressi, i.e. kas te lahkesti jätaksite ...)

On this analogy some students do not hesitate to write:

She smiled at us friendly.

The boy was sitting by the window, brooding melancholy.

They were arguing lively about something.

Unfortunately, these words have no corresponding adverbs of general currency, and the best way out is to add an appropriate noun (such as 'way', 'manner', 'fashion' etc.) and convey the idea in the form of a prepositional phrase:

She smiled at us in a friendly way. (Ta naeratas meile sõbralikult).

The boy was sitting by the window, brooding in a melancholy fashion (Poiss istus melanhoolselt akna juures)

They were arguing about something in a lively manner (Nad vaidlesid elavalt millegi üle).

Another possibility is to express the idea of the verb by means of a noun so that the adjective can be preserved unchanged and there is no need for an adverb at all. Many students will probably have noticed that in some cases where an Estonian verb is modified by an adverb the corresponding English construction consists of a noun modified by an adjective. This construction can be readily applied in all of the three examples given above, which might be recast as follows:

She gave us a friendly smile.

The boy was sitting by the window in a melancholy

## mood

or, since 'melancholy' is itself a noun:

The boy sat brooding by the window in a fit of melancholy.

They were engaged in a lively argument.

It would be wrong to assume from this discussion that no adjectives ending in -ly can be turned into adverbs in the usual way. Such words as 'jollily', 'sillily', 'holily' may be met with from time to time, though they are not to be recommended. Perhaps the main reason for their existence is that the -ly ending in all such cases not a suffix, but an inseparable part of the stem. There is also a colloquial tendency to use one or two of these adjectives as adverbs without change when they modify some other adjective which directly follows - as in 'beastly cold', 'heavenly cool', 'jolly hot', or when they occur in such expressions as "Don't talk silly" etc. But these phrases border on slang, and in Standard English there is a strong general feeling that adjectives ending in -ly cannot be turned into adverbs, whether we desire to add the suffix or not. In other words adjectives ending in -ly must be regarded as a special case. As a general rule they should be neither used as adverbs nor turned into adverbs, and when it is necessary to use them in an adverbial sense, the best course is to turn the whole sentence along the lines indicated above.

## 12. Adjective or adverb?

The general prevalence in English of the construction adjective + noun over that of verb + adverb may probably be partly explained by the existence of a large number of phrasal verbs consisting of a verb and a noun (e.g. 'take part', 'make use' etc.). Whenever a modifier is needed in such cases, it is attached to the noun, not the verb. Thus there are certain cases where an Englishman



will always - or at least very often - use an adjective, but an Estonian would normally prefer to use an adverb. Ignorance of this difference may be a source of an error, or even of downright blunders. At best it gives rise to expressions which are far less idiomatic than the corresponding adjective + noun combination.

Perhaps the most typical example here is the expression 'to take an active part', where most Estonian students who have not been warned of this particular pitfall would be inclined to write 'to take part actively', -which - to say the least - is not good English. Thus correct usage would require, for example:

Our people took an active part in the Amateur Art Festival (Meie rahvas võttis isetegevusolümpiaadist aktiivselt osa).

In much the same way, we should avoid saying:

You can use this material well some day  
since there is a far more idiomatic way of conveying the same idea:

You'll be able to put this material to good use  
some day (Kunagi saate seda materjali hästi ära kasutada).

Similarly

He helped us effectively  
sounds rather awkward or pedantic in English, and an Englishman would almost certainly prefer:

He gave us effective help (Ta abistas meid tõhusalt  
or: ta andis meile tõhusat abi).

### 13. 'Most' and 'best'

Many students seem to hesitate when they wish to raise to the superlative degree such a statement as "I like this

book more", they naturally enough jump to the conclusion that the superlative should be "I like this book most". This, unfortunately, is not quite correct. If we wish to preserve the word 'most' we should say:

I like this book most of all.

But the ordinary way of putting it would be:

I like this book best (or: best of all).

#### 14. The superlative degree of adverbs

All Estonian students know that the superlative degree of the adjective should normally be preceded by the definite article, e.g.:

Bob is the quickest runner in our class.

On this analogy quite a few of them use the article also with the superlative degree of the adverb, and write for example:

Bob ran the quickest and was the first to arrive.

But that is wrong. We must remember that only adjectives, not adverbs, are used with the article; and what we should say is:

Bob ran quickest and was the first to arrive (or simply: and was first to arrive).

Choose whichever seat you prefer - where you can see the screen best.

Uncle Jim worked hardest of all.

He who laughs last, laughs loudest.

#### A d v e r b s o f d e g r e e

#### 15. 'Very' or 'much' with participles?

Since in Estonian the word 'väga' is used indiscriminately with predicatives - whether they are adjectives or participles -, it comes quite natural to our students to use sentences like:

She was very pleased with her birthday presents;  
I was very surprised to meet them there;  
He is very experienced in these matters;  
They were very alarmed at the news;  
We were very charmed with our reception;  
The boy was very daunted by his father's tone;  
They were very interested in what we had to say.

However, it should be pointed out that this use of the adverb 'very' with a past participle is not regarded as quite correct by many English speakers. At the same time there are other native speakers who resort to it freely. It is clear that this phenomenon constitutes a problem for the English themselves. Earlier it used to be regarded as quite ungrammatical and the offending 'very' was promptly replaced by 'much', 'very much', 'highly', 'greatly' etc. Nowadays the situation has changed and many authorities find that 'very' can be permitted in certain cases, especially when it is used with participles which have gained current use as simple adjectives. Elsewhere, i.e. with participles which are not accepted as simple adjectives, or in sentences where we feel that they have retained their verbal function to a certain extent, 'very' should be rejected and one of the other alternatives should be preferred.

Now let us turn back to the examples with which we began. In the first four of them the past participles all have the force of a simple adjective and the general effect seems sufficiently natural and correct:

She was very pleased with her birthday presents;  
I was very surprised to meet them there;  
He is very experienced in these matters;  
They were very alarmed at the news.

All of these sentences would probably be acceptable to anyone who does not object to this usage on principle. But the last three do not sound quite so natural, and we feel that 'very' is not quite able to stand on its own legs, so to



Speak. That is why most people would prefer to say:

We were greatly charmed with the reception;

The boy was greatly daunted by his father's tone;

and They were very much (or: highly) interested in  
what we had to say.

In general we should remember that the use of 'very' alone followed by a past participle has not yet gained universal approval and for a foreigner learning English it may not always be easy to decide what sounds natural and what does not. If there is any uncertainty about the matter perhaps it is better to keep on the safe side and stick to the accepted usage. Even in the case of the first four examples no harm would be done by saying:

She was highly (or: greatly) pleased with her birthday presents.

I was extremely (or: very much, or: greatly) surprised to meet them there.

He is widely (or: deeply) experienced in these matters.

They were much (or: highly, or: greatly) alarmed at the news.

Some of these variants - especially the ones with 'much' alone - may seem a trifle stiff or formal, but there is at least no doubt that they are correct English.

#### 16. 'Very' or 'very much' with adjectival predicatives:

In addition to these partly adjectivised past participles, with which the use of 'very' may not always sound idiomatic, there is another category of words which may lead us to forthright blunders if used with 'very'. These are the adjectives 'afraid', 'alike' and 'ashamed', which function only as predicatives. They are a constant source of error and in student papers we often come across such bad expressions as 'very afraid', 'very alike' and 'very ashamed'. In all such cases 'very' must be replaced by

'very much', 'greatly', 'highly', or one of the other alternatives listed above:

The naughty boy was very much afraid of what would happen when his father came home.

These twins are very much alike.

I was greatly ('highly' or 'very much') ashamed of my ignorance.

To use 'very' alone in sentences of this kind would be little better than to translate the Estonian sentence "Ma armastan teda väga" by 'I love her very'.

#### 17. 'Too' or 'very'?

In colloquial Estonian the adverb of degree 'liiga' is often used simply to express a high degree of a certain quality. As a result some Estonian students tend to use the English adverb 'too' in much the same way and it is not uncommon for them to say or write:

We were at a loss what to do. The situation had become too critical.

Let's go home, it's too late already.

This happens particularly in negative sentences, e.g.:

The film wasn't too interesting.

This dress isn't too new, but it looks decent enough.

When we use the adverb 'too' in English, we normally have in mind the idea of excess - 'too much for something'. If this is not the case and we merely wish to express a high degree of a certain quality, the right word to use is 'very', or one of its many legitimate equivalents. Thus what we should say is:

We were at a loss what to do. The situation had become very critical (Olukord oli muutunud liiga (or: väga) kriitiliseks).

Let's go home, it's rather late already (lähme koju on juba liiga (or: väga) hilja).

The film wasn't particularly interesting (Film ei olnud liiga (or: eriti) huvitav).

This dress isn't so new, but it looks decent enough (See kleit ei ole liiga (or: eriti) uus, kuid ta näeb päris viisakas välja).

The standpoint outlined above should be taken as a general word of warning which most Estonian students would do well to bear in mind. But now, to be quite honest, we must modify our statement by two additional remarks. First of all, there is the idiomatic expression 'too bad', which is widely used in both England and America in the sense of "mul on väga kahju", and secondly we have to admit that there is an almost exact equivalent to the Estonian colloquial 'liiga', with the difference that the English 'too' must always be preceded by the words 'not any' or 'none', and perhaps also that the resulting English expression is a shade more familiar or slangy than its Estonian counterpart, as will be seen from the following examples:

I was none too pleased to see them come back so soon (Mul polnud kuigi hea meel nähes neid nii pea tagasi tulevat).

That hat doesn't suit you any too well (Ega see kübar sulle liiga (or: eriti) hästi küll ei sobi).

If you want to back out, it's none too soon for you to do so (Kui sa tahad ära öelda, siis on viimane aeg seda teha).

The show wasn't any too hot (i.e. it was a poor show; it wasn't much of a show or it wasn't particularly thrilling) (Etendus ei olnud suurem asi).

#### 18. 'Fairly' or 'rather'?

Another pair of adverbs of degree that need discussion are 'fairly' and 'rather'. Estonians hardly ever use 'fairly',



but tend to overwork 'rather'. In order to do full justice to both of them we should remember that 'rather' is a neutral word and can be used in any context, but 'fairly' implies the speaker's positive attitude or approval and consequently cannot be used to express a negative idea. Thus we can say:

The water is fairly (or: rather) deep here. Of course you can dive in (Vesi on siin kaunis sügav, siin võib küll sisse hüpata)

because we cannot dive in shallow water and we note with satisfaction that the water is deep enough for our purpose. But now let us compare this with the following sentence:

The lake is rather deep, I wouldn't like you to go swimming here (See järv on üsna sügav, ma ei tahaks, et sa siin ujuma lähed).

Here 'fairly' would be out of place, because the fact that the water is deep is a cause not for satisfaction, but for regret or disapproval. The person addressed is evidently not a good swimmer, and the water is so deep as to make it dangerous for him to swim there.

Or let us take another pair of examples. Both adverbs are possible in

This coffee is fairly (or: rather) strong, it ought to buck you up (See kohv on üsna kange, ta peaks teid ergutama)

because the fact that the coffee is strong is welcomed as a good thing. But in

The coffee was rather strong, I'm afraid I shan't get much sleep tonight (Kohv oli üsna kange, ma kardan, et mulle ei tule nüüd und),

the fact that the coffee was strong is treated as a disadvantage, and only 'rather' is possible.

On the whole, if we wish to avoid monotony, we might

do well to make more use of the word 'fairly' to express a positive attitude and reserve 'rather' for the numerous cases in which 'fairly' would be unsuitable.

19. 'Too' or 'either'?

Estonians are inclined to overwork the adverb 'too' in the meaning of 'as well' by using it indiscriminately in all types of sentences. It should be borne in mind that 'too' is used in affirmative and interrogative sentences, while in negative and negative-interrogative sentences the word needed is 'either':

He knows her too (Tema tunneb teda ka).

Does he know her too? (Kas tema ka tunneb teda?)

He doesn't know her either (Ega tema ka ei tunne teda).

Doesn't he know her either? (Kas tema ka ei tunne teda?).

## Adverbs of time

### 20. 'Upwards' or 'onwards'?

The two adverbs 'up' or 'upward(s)' and 'on' or 'onward(s)', when used in a figurative sense, are sometimes confused, the Estonian equivalent for both being 'alates'. Here it is best to keep to the simple rule that 'onward(s)' usually refers to time, while 'upward(s)' refers to degree:

They remained close friends from that time on(ward) (Sellest ajast alates jäid nad headeks sõpradeks).

He held important posts in the government from 1958 onwards (1958. aastast alates asus ta valitsuses tähtsatel ametikohtadel).

The prices of such cardigans may be anything from twenty roubles upwards (Selliste kampsunite hinnad algavad kahekümnest rublast).

The group consisted of children of different ages from five years up(wards) (Grupp koosnes erineva vanusega lastest viieast aastast alates).

Note also:

There were upwards of fifty people in the room (Toas oli üle viiekümne inimese).

### 21. 'First' or 'at first', 'last' or 'at last'?

Next we come to the vexed question of the choice between 'first' and 'at first', which is the cause of a surprisingly large number of blunders. Here, as elsewhere, we must not be too dogmatic and every now and again we may come upon a border-line case that defies all attempts at rigid classification. But it is none the less clear that the vast majority of mistakes fall into one of three possible groups, and by making a rough and ready distinction



between them we shall steer clear of the main pitfalls. These groups are as follows:

1. (First) Order or degree (Estonian 'esimesena', 'esimesel(e) kohal(e)', etc.). The current forms are 'first, second, third, fourth etc. ....last'. Neither the preposition 'at' nor the adverbial ending '-ly' is necessary :

I was first to come and last to go (Ma tulin esimesena ja lõksin viimasena).

Last but not least (Viimane, kuid mitte kõige tähtsusetum).

Who came first (second, third, .....last etc.) in the 100 metres this afternoon? (Kes tuli täna saja meetri jooksus esimeseks (teiseks, kolmandaks, ....viimaseks jne.)?)

Of all the considerations involved, peace ranks first (Kõigi muude kaalutluste seast on rahu esikohal).

2. (Secondly) Enumeration (Estonian 'esiteks' or 'kõigepealt', 'teiseks', etc.). Usage here seems to fluctuate between the simple forms and the adverbial ending: 'first(ly), second(ly), third(ly), last(ly)', etc. On the whole 'first' is more common than 'firstly', but 'lastly' is decidedly more common than 'last'. In writing and in formal speech there is naturally a tendency to keep the series uniform, i.e. to stick to one form or the other. But in colloquial English the -ly is often added after the initial steps in a long enumeration, and there is no reason why we should not say (as so many people do):

"First, ..., second(ly), ..., third(ly), ..., fourthly, ..., fifthly, ..., lastly ..."

A more formal series is: "In the first place", "In the second place", "In the third place", etc. But if there is no need to number off the separate items, after beginning

with "First . . .," we can simply introduce the following points with "Then . . .", "Then again . . .", etc.

3. (Thirdly) 'At first' means 'at the beginning' (Estonian 'esialgu'); 'at last' means 'in the end' (Estonian 'viimaks', '(lõppude) lõpuks'):

At first I could hardly believe my eyes (Alguses ma suutsin vaevalt oma silmi uskuda).

She was angry at first, but soon she could hardly keep (herself) from smiling (Esialgu ta oli pahane).

So you've come at last. (Lõpuks sa siis ikkagi tulid.)

At last they reached the top of the hill (Lõpuks jõudsid nad künka tipule).

Perhaps most of the mistakes made are due to the fact that the Estonian word 'kõigepealt' may mean either 'esiteks' ('first' or 'firstly') or 'esialgu', 'alguses' ('at first'), while 'lõpuks' may mean either 'the last of a series' (= 'lastly') or 'after the lapse of a certain space of time' (= 'at last'). These words should therefore be matched with particular care, and the following examples may be of some use:

'kõigepealt, esiteks, esimeses järjekorras':

First the speaker outlined the general background of the problem and then proceeded to discuss the separate points.

First (of all) I must thank you for your kindness in writing to me.

The teacher said to the pupils: "First (of all) I shall check up your homework and then we shall see a film"

'Esialgu, alguses, esimesel hetkel':

At first the children were a bit shy, but they soon plucked up their courage and began to ask the visitor questions.

At first we had planned to spend only a fortnight in the country, but when the weather changed we decided to stay on.

'Lõpuks, kõige viimasena':

And lastly I must warn you to be more careful in the future.

Lastly, I should like to pass round a few snaps taken on the trip so that you may have a clearer idea of what you have just heard about.

'Lõppude-lõpuks, viimaks':

At last I decided not to wait any more.

At last everything was ready and they all sat down to dinner.

## 22. Only

Another adverb which is often overworked by Estonian students, is 'only' in the meaning of 'alles'. True, there are many cases when this is the normal, if not the only possible English counterpart to the idea expressed in Estonian, e.g.:

He began writing poetry when he was only ten years old (Ta hakkas luuletama, kui ta oli alles kümneaastane)

or: I have only just heard the news (Kuulsin alles praegu seda uudist).

But if we merely need an adverbial modifier of time there is a good idiomatic construction at our disposal in the shape of 'negation + until' (or 'till'), which is unjustly neglected by so many of our students. Thus the sentence "Ta saabus alles eile" can be rendered in a number of different ways:

He arrived only yesterday.

Or, since 'alles' implies emphasis, we might use a more emphatic construction in English:



It was only yesterday that he arrived.

Then we have the construction 'negation + until':

He didn't arrive till yesterday,

which can also be made more emphatic in its turn:

It wasn't until yesterday that he arrived.

In many cases the construction 'negation + until' sounds much more natural and should consequently be preferred. For example the best translation of "Ta sõidab ära alles esmaspäeval" would be either

He won't be leaving till Monday

or its emphatic form:

It's not until Monday that he will leave.

The constructions with 'only':

He will only leave on Monday

and It's only on Monday that he will leave

are not only less idiomatic, but even sound somewhat ambiguous.

In this connection it should be remembered that if we open a sentence with an adverbial modifier or an adverbial clause introduced by 'only' inversion is obligatory:

Only after he had taken his seat did he notice us  
(Ta märkas meid alles siis, kui oli juba istet võtnud).

Only after sunset did the rain stop (Vihm lakkas  
alles pärast päikeseloojangut).

## 23. 'Still' and 'yet'

'Still' and 'yet' are both represented in Estonian by 'veel' and as a result are sometimes interchanged. This is

an unpardonable mistake, the more so since the rule is a very simple one. 'Still' is used in a positive sense, i.e. occurs in affirmative and interrogative sentences, and can also be translated by 'alles':

The children are still out in the playground  
(Lapsed on alles (or: veel) väljas mänguväljakul);

Are they still out of doors? (Kas nad on alles  
(or: veel) väljas?)

'Yet' is used in a negative sense and - at least in modern standard English - occurs only in negative sentences:

The children haven't come in yet (Lapsed pole veel  
sisse tulnud).

#### 24. 'Yet' or 'already'?

In interrogative sentences 'yet' has the meaning of 'juba':

Is Father back yet? (Kas isa on juba tagasi?)

Many of our students seem reluctant to use the word in this way, and prefer to fall back on 'already' which, as a general rule, is heavily overworked. In so doing they often overlook an important difference in meaning. When we use 'yet' we simply ask for information, whereas 'already' is an emotional word which expresses surprise at something that has happened sooner than we expected. Thus

Is Father back already?

should be translated:

Kas isa on siis juba tagasi?

#### 25. Other points in connection with 'already'

As we have seen, 'already' is another favourite word

of our students, and occurs much too often in both their speech and their written papers. Perhaps they will not be offended if we remind them that there are several other ways of conveying the meaning of the Estonian adverb 'juba' in English, and that in a surprisingly large number of cases there is no need to translate it at all.

In Estonian 'juba' is frequently used with the two perfect tenses, the so-called 'täisminevik' (Present Perfect) and 'enneminevik' (Past Perfect). More often than not the corresponding perfect tense in English is so complete in itself as to render the addition of 'already' quite superfluous.

I'd rather not go to the theatre this evening. I've seen the play once and don't want to see it a second time (Ma olen seda näidendit kord juba näinud)

They didn't know I had heard about the accident from my aunt (Nad ei teanud, et ma olin tädi käest sellest õnnetusest juba kuulnud).

Of course, it could hardly be called a mistake if we said:

I have already seen the play,  
or I had already heard about the accident,

but the adverb is not necessary and it is omitted in English as often as it is expressed in Estonian.

Then again, the adverb 'juba' very often helps to express duration in Estonian, whereas in English the Perfect or Perfect Continuous tenses are sufficient in themselves to express the same idea, especially when the adverb of time is preceded by the preposition 'for' which serves to express duration:

We have studied English for two years (Me õpime (or: oleme õppinud) inglise keelt juba kaks aastat).

I had worked at the Institute for a whole month



before I got acquainted with everybody in the lab (Ma olin instituudis töötanud juba tervelt kuu aega).

I shall have spent half the vac by the time you get to the rest-home (Selleks ajaks, kui sina puhkekodusse jõuad, on minul juba pool puhkust läbi).

I've been waiting for you for more than twenty minutes (Olen sind juba üle kahekümne minuti oodanud).

We had been talking for three hours and had exhausted most of the topics I could think of (Me olime juba kolm tundi juttu ajanud).

With the Past Indefinite tense the expressions 'as early as' and 'as far back as' can often be used to replace 'already'. Thus it is more natural to say

The castle was built as early as (or: as far back as) the beginning of the fourteenth century than the unidiomatic and clumsier

The castle was built already at the beginning of the fourteenth century,

though in both cases the normal Estonian translation would be:

See loss on ehitatud juba neljateistkümnenda sajandi alguses.

Or to take one more example:

Preparations for the Exhibition began as early as (or: as far back as) April last (Ettevalmistused näituseks algasid juba aprillikuus).

or: Preparations for the Exhibition were begun already last April.

Nor is there any need to translate the Estonian word 'juba' when it is used in conjunction with the phrase

'pärit olema' - to go (or date, or run) back to, to date from:

Many of our national traditions go (or: date) back to the distant past (Paljud meie rahvuslikud kombed on pärit juba kaugest minevikust).

The history of the school goes (or: runs) back to the end of the nineteenth century (Selle kooli ajalugu saab alguse juba 19. sajandi lõpust).

The oldest parts of the Cathedral date from the early Middle Ages (Katedraali vanimad osad pärinevad juba varasest keskajast).

Incidentally, the expressions 'as late as' and 'as recently as', which have exactly the opposite meaning to that of the equivalents for 'juba' ('as early as', 'as far back as'), may occasionally come in handy as equivalents for the Estonian adverb 'alles':

Serfdom in Czarist Russia was abolished as late as the middle of the nineteenth century (or: was not abolished until the middle of the nineteenth century) (Tsaarivenemaal kaotati pärisorjus alles üheksateistkümnenda sajandi keskel).

The first sputnik was launched as recently as 1957 (Esimene sputnik saadeti välja alles 1957. aastal).

## A d v e r b s o f p l a c e

### 26. Adverbs with verbs expressing movement.

Verbs expressing movement (to come, go, walk, move, step, run, etc.) are often used together with some adverb (over, across, along, round, up, down) which has no definite meaning, indicating little more than movement away from something or in a certain direction and which - especially in more formal usage - can also be omitted. Estonians usually feel no need for such adverbs and tend to omit them altogether. But in conversation they often make all the difference between natural, idiomatic speech and correct, but colourless "school-book" English:

Come round and see us whenever you have time  
(Tulge meid vaatama, kui aega saate).

Wait a moment, I'll go and look for him. He's  
just gone over to the neighbour's (Ta just nüüdsama  
läks naabri poole).

The man walked across to the counter and returned  
with a glass in his hand (Mees läks leti juurde).

A man stepped up to my friend and said he wanted  
to speak to him (Keegi mees astus mu sõbra juurde).

Emma has gone down to the country and won't be back  
before Monday (Emma läks maale).

Be a good boy, just run along to the baker's and  
buy another loaf of bread. (jookse pagari juurde).

### 27. 'There' and 'here'

The English construction 'there is' ('there are') is a difficult one for Estonians to master as it does not exist in their native language and they do not feel any need for it. After learning to form such sentences as "There is a book on the table", they tend to forget that the word 'there' is here a mere particle with no independent meaning of its own - not an adverb of place



corresponding to the Estonian equivalent 'seal'. This is illustrated by the fact that certain students, when asked to translate such sentences into Estonian, will not hesitate to reply: "Seal on raamat laua peal", although they can hardly be unaware of the fact that this sounds pretty unnatural in their mother tongue. Influenced by this mistaken notion, they then proceed to omit the adverb 'there' in sentences where it is really needed, evidently under the impression that it has already been expressed. Thus they translate the sentences

Seal oli igasuguseid inimesi  
and Seal on ilus pilt  
as There were all sorts of people  
and There is a beautiful picture.

Unfortunately, in so doing, they distort the meaning, for all they have succeeded in saying is that all sorts of people existed (Oli olemas igasuguseid inimesi), or that a beautiful picture exists somewhere (On olemas ilus pilt) without any reference to the place where these are to be found. What they should have said is:

There were all sorts of people there,  
and, There is a beautiful picture there.

In the same way it seldom occurs to many Estonians to use the adverb 'here' in a sentence containing the construction 'there is - there are'. But it is quite natural to say in English:

There are lots of things worth seeing here (Siin on palju vaatamisväärsusi),  
or There is a man here who wants to see you (Siin on mees, kes tahab teiega rääkida).

## 28. The superfluous 'there'

On the other hand there are cases where some of us feel

tempted to use the adverb 'there' where it is quite out of place, and where a prepositional phrase containing a pronoun or noun, or a totally different way of turning the sentence would be much more to the point. Thus instead of saying

This book is masterfully written. The characters there are true to life

we should say

The characters in it are so true to life,  
or simply

The characters are so true to life.

Or instead of

This sentence is very complicated. The words there are very long and uncommon,

we must say:

The words in it are so long and uncommon;  
or It contains such (or: very) long and uncommon words.

## THE PREPOSITION

### Prepositions with certain adverbial modifiers and attributes

Among the "favourite" mistakes of our students there are many made in the use of prepositions. As we know, the Estonian case relations are usually rendered by prepositions in English. Many English prepositions have several meanings, but most of them have one basic meaning, which nearly always answers to a given Estonian case ending. The result is that certain English prepositions have established themselves firmly in the minds of our students as the standard equivalents of certain Estonian cases. This association of ideas is natural enough, but now and then it may be misleading. Unfortunately, not all English verbs take prepositions which correspond exactly to the cases used in Estonian. And this is where mistakes creep in, if we have failed to notice the differences in usage between the two languages.

#### 29. 'To stay' and 'remain'

First of all let us take the verbs 'stay' and 'remain'. Their Estonian counterpart 'jääma' answers the question 'kuhu?'. In English, however, the question would be 'kus?', the same as in Russian (остаться где?). Consequently the correct prepositions in English are not 'to' or 'into', but 'at', 'in' or 'on':

I preferred to stay at home (Ma eelistasin jääda koju)

After lectures the members of the Y.C.L. remained at the university to discuss their plan of activities (Pärast loenguid jäid kommunistlikud noored veel ülikooli oma tööplaani arutama)..



We shall stay in town till the end of the month  
(Me jääme linna kuu lõpuni).

Are you going to stay here on the train or would  
you like to go for a short walk when we stop? (Kas  
te jääte rongi peale või lähete peatuses jalutama?)

### 30. 'To leave'

The same is true of the verb 'leave' in the meaning  
of 'jätma'. Here, once again, the Estonian case answers  
the question 'kuhu?' (as opposed to the Russian idiom  
'octa~~by~~тb r~~de~~?). In English we use the prepositions 'at'  
or 'in':

I suddenly recollected that I had left my bag at  
the chemist's (Äkki mulle meenus, et olin portfelli  
apteeki jätnud).

Be careful not to leave your purse in your overcoat  
pocket (Vaadake, et te ei jäta rahakotti palitutas-  
kusse).

### 31. 'To leave' or 'forget'?

In this connection I should like to add a remark con-  
cerning the choice of the verb. In Estonian we often use  
the verb 'unustama' in the sense of 'kogemata jätma'. But  
we must be careful never to use the English word 'forget'  
in the same way. Thus the Estonian sentence

Ma unustasin oma vihiku koju

would become in English

I left my notebook at home

or: I forgot to bring my notebook with me.

As you see, the word 'forget' is never used in the sense  
of to leave something somewhere. Neither can it be used in  
the sense of to leave something in a certain state or

condition. In this sense it is always followed by a verb, never by a noun. In Estonian we can say

Ma unustasin gaasi kinni keeramata.

But in English we should say either

I forgot to turn off the gas

or: I left the gas turned on, or:

I left the gas burning, as the case may be.

### 32. Other verbs implying not movement but rest in space

Other verbs that belong to the same type as 'leave' (30) are 'gather' and 'collect' (kogunema), 'hide' (peitma), 'conceal', 'hand in' (esitama, sisse andma), and the group 'write', 'note down', 'jot down', etc.

We shall gather at the Student Club at half past six (Me koguneme üliõpilasklubisse kell pool seitse).

All the students have gathered in the lecture-room (Kõik üliõpilased on auditooriumi kogunenud).

A huge crowd collected in the park (Parki kogunes tohutu rahvahulk).

A knot of children had collected at the shop window (Salk lapsi oli kogunenud kaupluse akna juurde).

The stolen bag had been hidden at a railway station (Varastatud portfell oli ära peidetud ühte raudteejaama).

The timid little girl hid (or: hid herself) in the next room and would not come out till the stranger had left (Kartlik tüdrukuke peitis enese kõrvaltuppa ja ei tulnud enne välja kui võõras oli ära läinud).

You must hand in your application at the Dean's Office (Te peate avalduse deканааti sisse andma).

He jotted something down in his diary (Ta märkis midagi oma päevikusse).

Write the rule down in your notebooks (Kirjutage

reegel oma vihikutesse).

33. 'To put'. 'set'. 'enter'

The same tendency holds good for such words as 'put' or 'set', as well as the verb 'enter' in the sense of to 'write' down':

A slight pressure on this button will suffice to put (or: set) the machine in motion (Piisab kergest vajutusest sellele nupule, et panna masin käima).

The boy put the apple in his pocket (Poiss pani õuna taskusse).

But with this group of verbs the preposition 'into' is also possible. There is no reason why we should not say:

The boy put the apple into his pocket.

Such a sentence as "Kandke see gisse arveraamatusse" might be rendered simply: "Put it down in your ledger" (or: account-book)". But if we prefer the more formal word 'enter', we may use either preposition:

Enter it in your account-book

or: Enter it into your account-book.

However, in every case where we are free to choose, we should bear in mind that 'in' is much more common and sounds more natural and idiomatic where no emphasis is implied. On the other hand 'into' is more precise, and a shade more emphatic.

34. 'To be'

A similar question arises in connection with the verb 'to be'. It is important to remember that the Present and Past Perfect tenses of the verb 'to be' are invariably followed by the preposition 'to' (never 'in') when they are used to indicate a journey to a certain place. Thus we say:



Have you ever lived in Moscow? (Kas te olete Kunagi Moskvas elanud?)

but: Have you ever been to Moscow? (Kas te olete kunagi Moskvas käinud?)

35. Where or where from?

The same problem crops up in connection with certain verbs, such as 'ostma', 'leidma', 'lugema' etc., which are followed by the Elative Case in Estonian. Thus in Estonian these verbs require an adverbial modifier in the Elative or Ablative Case answering the question 'kust?'. But in English the correct preposition is not 'from', but again 'at', 'in' or 'on':

I bought this dictionary at a second-hand bookshop (Ostsin selle sõnastiku antikvariaadist).

We bought some fine records in Riga (Riias ostsime häid grammofoniplaate).

Where did you find that handkerchief? - On the stairs (Kust sa leidsid selle taskuräti? - Trepi-kojast).

What an interesting vase! - Yes, I picked it up quite by chance at a bargain sale (Milline huvitav vaas. - Jah, leidsin selle juhuslikult odavalt väljamüügilt (i.e. sattusin sellele peale).

Everything found in the street should be taken to the Lost Property Office (Kõik mis tänavalt leitakse, tuleb viia Leiubüroosse).

He turned the whole house upside-down before he finally discovered the missing letter in the bottom drawer of his writing desk (Ta pööras terve maja pahupidi enne kui avastas puuduva kirja oma kirjutuslaua alumisest laekast).

In the same way we say in Estonian 'lugema kust?', but in English the proper preposition is 'in', not 'from':

We read the news in today's newspaper (Lugesime  
seda uudist tänasest ajalehest).

He must have read about those things in some book  
(Ta on ilmselt neid asju kuskilt raamatust lugenud).

### 36. 'To' or 'into' to indicate direction

Next I should like to say a few words about the differences in use between the prepositions 'to' and 'into'. They both indicate direction and are expressed by the Illative Case in Estonian, answering the question 'where to?' (kuhu?). Since all words denoting some sort of room or building can be used with either of them and in all cases their Estonian translation is exactly the same, students often find it difficult to choose the correct preposition. Moreover, very often they do not even try to choose between the two variants because they are hardly even aware of the difference in the shade of meaning between such phrases as 'to the room' and 'into the room'. However, the difference is quite clear and may perhaps be broadly defined as follows: the preposition 'to' indicates movement in the direction of a room or building some distance away, whereas 'into' emphasises the idea of entering a room or building which is in our immediate vicinity. E.g.:

The Secretary took us to the engineer's office at the end of the corridor (Sekretär viis meid koridori lõpus asuvasse inseneri kabinetti).

Here it is clear that the office was a fair distance away from the place where we originally found ourselves together with the secretary. But in such a sentence as

Amy opened the door and pushed Anne into the Headmaster's office (Amy avas ukse ja tõukas Anne direktori kabinetti).

the point of departure is just behind the door of the

Headmaster's office and Anne has only to cross the threshold to find herself inside. In Estonian we sometimes add the preposition 'sisse' to stress much the same idea:

Amy avas ukse ja tõukas Anne direktori kabinetti sisse.

Let us take a few more examples:

I can come to the shop with you all right. Mother asked me to buy some sugar (Võin küll sinuga poodi kaasa tulla. Ema palus, et ma suhkrut ostaksin) (The two speakers have evidently some way to go before they reach the shop).

But: After the quarrel David began to avoid his former friends. Whenever he noticed one of them in the street he would turn aside and step into some nearby shop or archway (Pärast tüli hakkas David oma endisi sõpru vältima. Kui ta mõnda neist tänaval märkas, pööras ta kõrvale ja astus mõnda kauplusesse või võlvialusesse, mis juhtus lähedal asuma).

Or: If you want to see Jack, you'll have to go to the garage. He is overhauling his car there (Kui te tahate Jackiga kokku saada, siis tuleb teil minna garaaži. Ta vaatab seal oma autot üle). Here the speaker is clearly not in the immediate vicinity of the garage, though he may be in the house or somewhere else not so far away).

But: The boy whom we had addressed went into the garage and came out together with an elderly man (Poiss, kelle poole me olime pöördunud, läks garaaži sisse ja tuli välja koos ühe vanema mehega). (In other words, the boy whom we addressed happened to be close by the garage at that particular moment);



37. Sentences with two adverbial modifiers (of direction and place)

A distressingly large number of mistakes are made in attempts to translate Estonian sentences which contain two adverbial modifiers of place indicating direction, e.g.:

Isa sõitis Kaukaasiasse pubkekodusse.

In English only one of them is regarded as indicating direction, while the other constitutes a sort of attribute indicating position in space and is consequently expressed by means of the preposition 'in' or 'at'. Thus the translation of the above-mentioned example would be:

Father has gone to a rest-home in the Caucasus.

Now for a few more examples:

Vanaisa oli läinud lähemasse linna laadale (Grandfather had gone to a fair in the neighbouring town).

Nad kolisid küla äärde väikesesse majakesse (They moved to a little cottage on the outskirts of the village).

Pakk saadeti Austraaliasse Melbourne'i linna (The parcel was addressed to Melbourne in Australia).

Minge neljandale korrusele Informatsioonibüroosse (Go to the Information Bureau on the third floor).

38. 'With' to express cause

Now we come to another problem, which is also the source of a large number of unnecessary mistakes. This is the question of cause relationships, which are normally expressed in English with the help of the preposition 'with'.

In Estonian we usually have recourse to the Elative Case, which to some students seems to call for the preposition 'from'. 'From', however, rarely occurs in this sense in English, and should be used with caution.

First of all, let us take a few typical examples:

There was a biting wind and by the time the bus arrived we were all shivering with cold (Tuul oli lõikav ja selleks ajaks, kui buss saabus, lõdisesime kõik külmast, or: külma pärast).

The patient groaned with pain (Patsient oigas valut, or: valu pärast).

We could not sit down as the bench was wet with rain (Me ei saanud istuda, sest pink oli vihmast märg).

His shoes and socks were black with mud (Ta kingad ja sokid olid mudast mustad).

Her eyes were black with hate (Ta silmad olid vihkamisest mustad).

The river ran red with blood (Jõevesi oli verest punane), etc.

In all of these examples no other preposition but 'with' can be used, with the single exception of the expression "wet with rain". Here 'from' is also possible, but would require the addition of a definite article, which gives rise to a slight change in the shade of the meaning. This leaves us with the choice between two variants:

The bench was wet with rain  
and The bench was still wet from the rain,

the first being non-committal, the second referring to a shower of rain which has already been mentioned.

### 39. Attributive phrases

Another example of where the Estonian case is often wrongly allowed to dictate the English preposition is to be found in such sentences as

Kõik õpilased meie klassist on kommunistlikud noored

and Mõned üliõpilased meie grupist tegutsesid draamaringis.

Here many of our students mechanically resort to the preposition 'from' (all the pupils from our class, some students from our group). The correct prepositions, however, are 'in' or 'of':

All the pupils in our class are members of the Y.C.L.

or: All the pupils of our class are members of the Y.C.L.

and: Some students in our group are active in the Dramatic Club;

or: Some students of our group are active in the Dramatic Club.

In such sentences it is possible to use the Genitive Case in Estonian too:

Kõik meie klassi õpilased ...,  
Mõned meie grupi üliõpilased ...

Sometimes, however, in place of the Genitive attribute in Estonian it is better to use a preposition of place in English:

Kogu küla rahvas pidas lugu vanast õpetajast (All the people in the village respected the old teacher).

Toa sisustus oli tumedast tammepuust (The furniture in the room was made of dark oak).

Inglismaa kliima on pehmem kui meil (The climate in England is much milder than ours).

But when the Genitive attribute in Estonian expresses purpose, it is rendered by the preposition 'for':

Meie tänane Konversatsiooniteema on "Aastaajad"



(Our topic for conversation today is "The Seasons of the Year").

Kateedrijuhataja teatas meile diplomitööde teenad inglise keele alal (The Head of the Chair announced the subjects for the diploma theses in English).

Uue teatri projekt kiideti heaks (The project for the new theatre was adopted).

### Verbs calling for certain prepositions

#### 40. Verbs expressing breaking or destroying

And now for another group of verbs, such as 'fall', 'tear', 'shatter', 'rend' etc., which express the idea of breaking or destroying. These demand the preposition 'to' or 'in', not 'into':

The vase fell in a thousand pieces (Vaas kukkus kildudeks).

There was a loud explosion and the house fell in ruins (Kostis tugev plahvatus ja maja langes rusudeks).

She cut the cake in six pieces and gave one to each of the children (Ta lõikas koogi kuueks tükiks).

Our bombers blew their defences to smithereens (Meie pommitajad tegid nende kaitse pihuks ja põrmuks).

He tore the letter to pieces (Ta rebis kirja tükkideks).

The whole class was rent in two by the quarrel over the excursion (Klass oli kaheks lõhenenud tüli pärast ekskursiooni üle).

The window-pane was shattered to pieces (Aknaklaas purunes kildudeks).

#### 41. Movement in a certain direction

Another class of verbs is made up of such words as 'rush' (tormama), 'dart' (sööstma), 'start' (teele asuma), 'make' (suunduma), 'be bound' (teel olema, minema), 'leap',

'jump' and 'spring'. These are followed not by 'to', but 'for', to indicate direction:

As soon as the match was over everybody rushed for the bus stop (Niipea kui võistlus oli läbi, tormasid kõik bussipeatusse).

The cat snatched a sausage from the table and darted for the door (Kass napsas laualt vorsti ja sõõs-tis ukse poole).

It's about time we started for the station (Meil on paras aeg hakata jaama poole minema).

Having finished exploring the inland, the expedition made for the coast (Lõpetanud sisemaa uurimise, suundus ekspeditsioon rannikule).

The ship is bound for Australia (Laev on teel (or: peab sõitma) Austraaliasse).

The dog sprang for the bone (Koer hüppas kondi järele).

The boy jumped for the ball, but missed it (Poiss hüppas palli püüdes, kuid ei saanud seda kätte).

#### 42. 'To happen'

Another very common mistake is to use the preposition 'with' after the verb 'to happen', under the influence of the Estonian Comitative. The proper preposition in English is not 'with' but 'to'; and we should say:

What's happened to your fountain-pen? (Mis su täitesulepeaga on juhtunud?)

Don't be afraid. Nothing will happen to you (Ära karda. Ega sinuga midagi ei juhtu).

#### 43. 'To suffer' and 'To die'

There are a few special cases which should be borne in mind, since the English usage differs from the Estonian. These include the verbs 'suffer' and 'die'. The former

requires 'from', the latter usually 'of', though 'to die from' may also be met from time to time. Thus we have:

She suffers a great deal from the cold (Ta kannatab palju külma pärast).

I've never heard of anyone dying of love (Ma pole veel kuulnud, et keegi armastusest oleks surenud).

Keats died of ( or from) consumption. (Keats suri tuberkuloosi).

#### 44. 'To interfere'

The verb 'to interfere' is followed not by 'into' (as many Estonians would seem to think), but by 'in' when it means 'to intervene' or 'take part in something' (millesegi sekkuma), and by 'with' when it means 'to meddle', 'hinder' or 'prevent':

I had to wait because I couldn't very well interfere in their conversation (Pidin ootama, sest ma ei võinud nende jutuajamisse vahelle segada).

The baby's illness has interfered with my work rather badly (Lapse haigus segas tunduvalt minu tööd).

Jack's aunt is too fond by half of interfering with other people's affairs (Jacki tädi armastab kangesti end teiste asjadesse segada).

#### 45. 'To go' + gerund

Occasionally, though fortunately not very often, we meet students who choose to use the preposition 'to' after the verb 'go' followed by a gerund expressing some sort of action (e.g. to go to skiing, to swimming, to shopping etc.) probably on the analogy of 'to go to the cinema' etc. However, there is a clear difference between these two patterns. The phrase 'to the cinema' serves as an adverbial modifier of place in which the noun is preceded by the preposition 'to' to show direction, whereas



the gerund 'skiing' is not an adverbial modifier of place and no direction is implied. In other words, the two constructions have nothing in common, and combinations of the type 'to go + gerund' need no preposition:

We intend to go hitch-hiking this summer (Suvel kavatseme minna autostopiga matkama).

The water is too cold to go swimming (Vesi on üjuma minemiseks liiga külm).

I'm afraid Tony isn't in, he's gone skating (Tonyt pole kahjuks kodus, ta läks uisutama).

#### 46. 'To pay attention'

In Estonian the expression 'tähelepanu osutama' is followed by the Allative Case (millele), which is usually translated by the preposition 'on'. But the corresponding English construction requires 'to':

She paid no attention to his objections (Ta ei osutanud tähelepanu tema vastuväidetele).

You should pay more attention to your pronunciation (Te peaksite osutama rohkem tähelepanu oma hääldamisele).

#### 47. 'To get used' and its equivalents

The Comitative Case required by the Estonian verb 'harjuma' (millegagi) is occasionally rendered by the preposition 'with' in English. This is a blunder, the proper preposition being 'to':

The family found it difficult to get used to Uncle's habits (Perekonnal oli raske onu harjumustega ära harjuda).

She is already accustomed to her new surroundings (Ta on uue ümbrusega juba harjunud).

You'll settle down to your new life in the course of time (Aja jooksul harjud oma uue eluga ära).

#### 48. 'To approach'

Mistakes or hesitation are frequently caused by the verb 'approach'. Since the corresponding Estonian verb (millelegi) 'läheneda' is followed by the Allative Case, our students often use the preposition 'to' with the verb 'approach' in English. Unfortunately 'to' is incorrect, and we should bear in mind that in the concrete or physical sense, indicating movement in a given direction, 'approach' needs no preposition whatever, but simply takes a direct object:

The train slowed down as we approached the town  
(Rong aeglustas käiku, kui me linnale lähenesime).

The foal approached us timidly (Varss lähenes  
meile arglikult).

#### 49. 'To manage'

Many Estonians are tempted to use the verb 'to manage' with the preposition 'with' on the analogy of the Comitative Case used in their own language (millegagi või kellegagi toime tulema või hakkama saama). In English, however, 'with' is always wrong, and the verb is followed by a direct object in the sense of 'to handle, control, guide or run something':

The child is so lively that it's quite a job to manage him (Laps on nii elav, et on tegemist, et temaga hakkama saada).

Don't expect Harry to help you. He can't manage his own affairs (Ta ei tule omaenese asjadegagi toime)

Or it may be followed by an infinitive:

Do you really think he'll manage to do so many things at once? (Kas te tõesti arvate, et ta tuleb korraga nii paljude asjadega toime?)

I was so taken aback I could hardly manage to get

a word out of my mouth (Olin nii kohkunud, et sain vaevalt sõna suust).

Very often the infinitive is omitted because it is understood or taken for granted, and when it is used in a general sense 'to manage' becomes in fact an ordinary intransitive verb:

It's simple enough. I'm sure you'll manage all right (i.e. to do the job) (Olen kindel, et te tulete sellega toime).

The prepositional phrase 'with it', which some students might be tempted to add, would be quite out of place.

There's so much to do, I'm afraid I won't manage (i.e. to get everything done) in one day (Kardan, et ühe päevaga ei tule ma sellega toime).

#### 50. 'To apologise'

Very often the rendering of the Estonian verb 'vabandama' (kellegi ees) causes hesitation with regard to the preposition required. 'Before', which is suggested by Estonian usage, is quite wrong, the correct English preposition being 'to'. Moreover, Estonians are sometimes tempted to follow up the verb 'to apologise' with a subordinate clause introduced by the conjunction 'that'. This is also impossible in English, which requires a prepositional phrase introduced by 'for', followed by a noun or gerund. Thus the correct constructions in English are 'to apologise to somebody for something' and 'to apologise to somebody for doing something':

Teddy apologised (to us) for not answering (or: having answered) our letter immediately (Teddy vabandas meie ees, et ta ei olnud meie kirjale kohe vastanud).



I must apologise to Dolly for not going to her birthday party (Ma pean Dolly ees vahandama, et ma ei saanud ta sünnipäevale minna).

If you tread on anyone's toes you must apologise to them (for your clumsiness) (Kui sa kellelegi varba peale astud, pead tema ees vahandama).

Nouns used with certain  
prepositions

51. Names of diseases

With the names of diseases the preposition we need is 'with':

A fortnight later Anne's sister also fell ill with mumps (Kaks nädalat pärast Annet jäi tema õde samuti mumps).

Lots of children were ill with the measles during the epidemic last winter (Paljud lapsed olid leetris).

My brother won't be coming to the stadium this afternoon, he's down with the flu (ta on gripis).

I wondered why I didn't see Emily there. But now I hear she's been laid up with pneumonia for quite some time (Ta on olnud juba tükk aega kopsupõletikus).

52. Journeys and trips

Another thing that we should remember is that we go, set out or are bound not 'to' but 'on' a journey, voyage, trip, tour, excursion, expedition, picnic or outing:

I intend to go on a long journey during the summer holidays (Suvevaheajal kavatsen minna pikale reisile).

Next week the ice-breaker will set out on its second voyage to the Arctic Ocean (Tuleval nädalal asub jäälõhkuja oma teisele reisile Põhja-Jäämerele).

My mother has gone on a 'business trip to Moscow (Ema sõitis Moskvasse komanderingusse).

Soon the Male Choir will go on a concert tour in the South (Varsti sõidab meeskoor lõunasse ringreisile).

At the end of the spring term the whole class will go on an excursion to Saaremaa (Kevadsemestri lõpul läheb kogu klass Saaremaale ekskursioonile).

A team of geologists is preparing to set out on an expedition to Lapland (Grupp geoloogide valmistas minema ekspeditsioonile Lääne-Euroopasse).

On Sunday the students of our group will go on a picnic (Pühapäeval lähevad meie rühma üliõpilased väljasõidule).

### 53. Tone of voice

Our next point is concerned with ways of reporting speech. When we refer to a person's voice or tone we use the preposition 'in', not 'with' as in Estonian:

The man spoke in an angry tone (Mees rääkis vihasel toonil).

Read the letter out in a clear voice (Lugege kiri ette selge häälega).

The girl told us the news in a loud whisper (Tüdruk jutustas meile uudist valju sosinaga).

True, 'with' is sometimes to be found in conjunction with the word 'voice', especially in somewhat academic phrases such as "with a great voice", but 'in' is always right and for all practical purposes should always be preferred.

### 54. Kinds of weather

Another case where in Estonian the Comitative Case, but in English the preposition 'in' should be used is represented by the words 'weather', 'rain', 'storm', 'thunderstorm', 'snowstorm', 'hail' etc.:

Children should not be taken out in too cold weather (Idiga külma ilmaga ei tohiks lapsi välja viia).

Planes do not take off in a thunderstorm (Äikesega lennukid ei lenda välja).

You can't wear that hat in the rain (Vihmaga ei saa seda mütsi pähe panna).

## 55. Accidents

The preposition 'in' is also used with such words as 'accident', 'plane crash', 'shipwreck' etc.:

Two persons were injured in a street accident yesterday (Eile said liiklusõnnetusel kaks inimest vigastada).

All the passengers were killed in the plane crash (Kõik reisijad hukkusid lennuõnnetusel).

The young sailor had never been in a shipwreck before (Noor madrus polnud veel kunagi laevaõnnetust üle elanud).

## 56. 'Reason'

Another common stumbling-block is the word 'reason'. This requires the preposition 'for', not 'of':

What is the reason for his absence? (Mis on tema puudumise põhjuseks?)

Suddenly the boy burst out laughing for no apparent reason at all (Korraga pahvatas poisil ilma mingi nähtava põhjuseta naerma).

Betty is inclined to take offence for no reason at all (Betty kipub solvuma täiesti põhjuseta).

## 57. Nouns expressing emotion

Another general point to remember is that abstract nouns expressing emotion, such as 'feeling', 'love',



'affection', 'admiration', 'respect', 'hatred' and 'pity' are normally followed by the preposition 'for'. The preposition 'against', which is suggested by the postposition 'vastu' used with some of these words in Estonian, is quite out of place in English.

Harry was not quite able to conceal his feelings for Mary (Harry ei suutnud hästi oma tundeid Mary vastu varjata).

A mother's love for her children is unselfish and unbounded (Ema armastus oma laste vastu on omakasupüüdmatu ja piiritu).

Grandfather's affection for his little granddaughter was really touching (Vanaisa armastus oma väikese pojatütre vastu oli tõepoolest liigutav).

The war poets of Vietnam express the hatred of their people for their enemy, and their firm determination to drive him out of their country (Vietnami sõjapöödid väljondavad oma rahva viha vaenlase vastu ja tema kindlat otsust vaenlane maalt välja kihutada).

All the boys feel a great admiration for Dick, who is the champion boxer of the school (Kõik poisid tunnevad suurt imetlust Dicki vastu, kes on nende kooli poksisõmpion).

All children should be taught to show respect for their elders (Kõik lapsed peaksid õppima vanemaid inimesi austama).

We were all full of pity for the poor child (Meil kõigil oli vaesest lapsest väga kahju).

But it should be borne in mind that the expression 'to have (or take) pity' requires the preposition 'on' (or 'upon'):

We took pity on the poor dog and we brought it home with us (Meil hakkas vaesest koerast kahju ja me tõime ta koju kaasa).

Poor Cinderella's cruel stepmother had no pity on her, and made her life as hard as she could (Kurjal vöörasemal ei olnud vassest Tuhkatrilinust põrmugi kahju ja ta tegi ta elu nii raskeks kui suutis).

These general rules will be found to cover the vast majority of cases. But perhaps it will be advisable to add a few remarks on special uses of the words 'love', 'hatred' 'feeling' and 'admiration' in order to make the survey more or less complete.

#### 58. 'Feeling'

To begin with the word 'feeling'. When this refers to a sensation of some kind we naturally use the preposition 'of': 'a feeling of cold', 'a feeling of wonder', 'a feeling of uncertainty' etc., etc. The expression 'a feeling for something' usually carries the meaning of 'a sense of', 'good taste', 'a flair for'. So we can say for example:

He has no feeling for style (Tal puudub stiilitunne).

Her taste in dressing reveals a sensitive feeling for the latest style in fashion (Tema maitsekus riietumisel annab tunnistust peenest meetaibust).

But when used in the plural the same word indicates an emotional attitude to some other person or thing, especially one of affection:

I made no secret of my feelings for the old house (Ma ei varjanud tundeid, mis mul olid vana maja vastu).

Your feelings for my sister do you credit (Teie kiindumus minu õesse teeb teile au).

Nothing is more sacred than our feelings for the dead (Pole midagi pühamat kui meie tunded surnute vastu).

If this emotional attitude is hostile we should do well to

avoid the use of 'for' and to replace it by some more neutral substitute, as for example:

I'd rather not discuss my feelings with regard to my neighbours (Ma parema meelega ei räägi oma tunnet oma naabrite vastu), etc.

59. 'Love', 'admiration', 'hatred'

In the case of the words 'love', 'admiration', 'hatred' etc. the choice is slightly different. When these refer to things or ideas the correct preposition is 'of':

His love of comfort was known to everybody (Tema mugavusearmastus oli kõigile tuntud).

I did not dare to tell her the news as I knew her hatred of gossip (Ma ei julgenud talle seda uudist, rääkida, sest teadsin, kuidas ta keelepeksu vihkab).

Admiration of bravery is a characteristic feature in all boys (Vapruse imetlemine on kõigile poistele omane).

- though perhaps 'for' is just possible here.

'Love', 'hate' or 'hatred', apart from the distinction mentioned above, can be used with either 'for' or 'of'. There is no difficulty with the former, which also expresses a clear, objective relationship, as in one's love for one's country, 'a mother's love for her children', etc. But when using 'of' care should be taken to avoid ambiguity. 'A father's love' is 'isa armastus' or 'armastus isa vastu'. For this reason the latter construction, though logically sound, is not to be recommended, and wherever possible the of-phrase should be replaced either by the Possessive Case ('a father's love) or by 'for' (one's love for one's father).

60. 'Fond', 'fondness'

The words 'fond' and 'fondness' are used in different



ways: the adjective 'fond' is invariably followed by 'of':

She is very fond of her mother (Ta armastab oma ema väga).

Little Tommy is fond of sweets, skating, going to the pictures, etc. (Väike Tommy armastab maiustusi, uisutamist, kinoskäimist jne.);

but the noun 'fondness' usually requires 'for', especially when it is used in the sense of 'partiality' or 'affection for'. Thus we can talk of an old lady's fondness for cats, ice cream, little children etc., etc. True, 'fondness' may occasionally be followed by 'of' when it refers to some characteristic habit or practice. We can speak of a person's 'fondness of motoring', or say that 'his fondness of skating on thin ice will land him in trouble' (incidentally, not 'into' trouble). But even here 'for' is possible, and in most cases would probably be preferred.

#### 61. 'Sympathy'

'Sympathy' can be used with either 'for' or 'with', the former being, perhaps, slightly more common. Thus we can say, more or less indifferently, either:

I have no sympathy with lazy people

or I have no sympathy for lazy people (Ma ei tunne laiskadele kaasa).

The latter construction has a useful parallel in the popular phrase 'to have no time for', and a more idiomatic translation of "Ma ei salli laiskvorste" would be:

I have no time for lazy people.

#### 62. 'Farm' 'Ranch' etc.

In Estonian we use the Inessive Case with the words 'talu', 'kolhoos', 'sovhoos', 'rantso' etc., when they

function as adverbial modifiers of place. In English the normal preposition preceding the words 'farm', 'collective farm', 'state farm', 'ranch' etc. is 'on'. 'At' is also used in this connection, and it is often rather difficult to distinguish between the two of them. But 'in', which the Estonian usage suggests, is never correct:

Peter had been brought up on a farm in North Carolina (Peeter oli kasvanud ühes farmis Põhja-Carolina osariigis).

In September many students worked on collective farms, helping to bring in the harvest (Septembris töötasid paljud üliõpilased kolhoosides, abistades viljakoristustöödel).

Tom's father is an agronomist on a state farm (Tomi isa on ühes sovhoosis agronoomiks).

The Pattersons often spend a week-end on a ranch in the mountains (Pattersonid veedavad sageli nädalalõpu mägedes asuvas rantsos).

### 63. 'Margin' and 'tree'

The position is reversed with words like 'margin' and 'tree' which are preceded by 'in', not 'on', in prepositional phrases expressing place relations:

Somebody had made notes in the margin of the book (Keegi oli raamatu äärele märkmeid teinud).

Write down the date in the margin of your exercise-book (kirjutage kuupäev vihiku äärele).

Birds were singing in the trees and bushes (Linnud laulsid puudel ja põõsastel).

The boy had hidden himself in (or up) a tree and was not to be found so easily (Poiss oli enese puu otsa peitnud ja teda oli päris raske üles leida).

### 64. 'Pictures'

In the same way, with such words as 'picture', 'photo',

'snap' 'painting' etc. the correct preposition is nearly always 'in', not 'on':

What can you see in this picture? (Mida te sellel pildil näete?)

You have changed so much. I could hardly recognize you in the photo (Te olete nii palju muutunud. Ma ei tundnud teid fotol ära).

In this snap you will see my brother and sister as little children (Sellel fotol näete mu venda ja õde lastena).

In a series of paintings the artist has depicted the landscapes of his native country (Real maalidel on kunstnik kujutanud oma kodumaa maastikke).

#### 65. 'Map'

The one exception is the word 'map', which prefers the preposition 'on':

Can you find it on the map? (Kas te leiate selle kaardil üles?)

Only the largest rivers are shown on the map (Ainult kõige suuremad jõed on kaardil ära toodud).

The completion of this new factory should definitely put our town on the map (i.e. make it one of the most important towns in the district) (Kui see uus vabrik valmis saab, läheb meie linn kindlasti maakaardile).

#### Adjectives requiring certain prepositions

#### 66. 'Characteristic'. 'typical'

In addition to the verbs and nouns discussed above there are also one or two adjectives which require different prepositions to what we might be led to expect from



Estonian usage. Here belong such words as 'characteristic' and 'typical', which are followed by the preposition 'of' not 'to', as some Estonian students mistakenly believe:

These trees are typical of the subtropical flora of the Caucasus (Need puud on tüüpilised Kaukaasia länhistroopilisele taimestikule).

Nothing was more characteristic of the man than the way he walked (Miski ei olnud sellele mehele iseloosulikum kui tema kõnnak).

#### 67. 'Late'. 'early'

On the other hand, the adjectives 'late' and 'early' require the preposition 'for':

If you don't set out immediately, you will be late for school (Kui sa kohe minema ei hakka, jääd kooli hiljaks).

We were too early for the concert and the hall was quite empty (Me jõudsime kontserdile liiga vara ja saal oli päris tühi).

#### 68. 'Same'

A peculiar mistake which is by no means as rare as it should be, arises in sentences containing the adjective 'same'. Every English teacher must have heard such sentences as "I live in the same house with John" or "Tom is of the same age with my brother" or "We are in the same group with Mary". Here the preposition 'with' is suggested by the Estonian Comitative:

Ma elan Johniga ühes majas;  
Tom on minu vennaga ühevanune;  
Me oleme Mary'ga ühes grupis.

In all such cases the preposition 'with' should be replaced by the relative pronoun 'as'. Thus the correct English

renderings of the above-mentioned Estonian sentences would be:

I live in the same house as John;

Tom is of the same age as my brother;

We are in the same group as Mary.

The last example "We are in the same group as Mary" has only one meaning in English, that is: Meie olene sellõssa-  
mas grupis kus Mary'gi". But when we say in Estonian "Me  
olene Mary'ga ühes grupis" we mean one of the two quite  
different things, either "Meie ja Mary olene ühes ja  
sellõssamas grupis" or "Mina ja Mary olene ühes ja sellõs-  
samas grupis". This peculiarity of Estonian idiom is a  
source of frequent mistakes in English. Thus students often  
say:

We went to the theatre with her

or: We chatted about our schooldays with the girls,

when what they really mean is:

I went to the theatre with her,

and: I chatted with the girls about our schooldays.

In English we can also say here:

She and I went to the theatre,

and: The girls and I chatted about our schooldays.

#### 69. Wrong uses of 'with'

In general we should do well to remember that in the vast majority of cases the preposition 'with' is used to indicate that there are two parties to a transaction, and that they do something together. If this is not what is meant the preposition 'with' is as likely as not out of place. For instance it is wrong to say:

The man was handsome and with very good manners,  
meaning: Mees oli ilus ja väga heade kometega.  
What we should say is:

The man was very handsome and had very good manners.

Neither can we translate "Sa ei tohi saabastega magama heita" word for word by saying in English:

You must not go to bed with your boots.

This, if it means anything at all, could only be taken to mean:

Sa ei tohi oma saabastega koos magada.

If we wish to preserve the with-phrase we must add the word 'on' and say:

You must not go to bed with your boots on,

which is the normal way of expressing the idea in English. Otherwise the correct translation would be:

You must not go to bed in your boots,

though this is a shade more formal or more artificial.

#### 70. Adjectives expressing fame

The adjectives 'famous', '(well)-known', 'renowned', 'celebrated', 'notorious', 'remarkable' etc. require the preposition 'for' to express the source of the fame:

Tallinn is renowned for its mediaeval buildings  
(Tallinn on kuulus oma keskaegsete ehitise poolest);

The old fellow is known all over the village for  
his interesting stories of the past (Vanamees on kõgu  
külas tuntud oma huvitavate lugudega vanast ajast).

France is famous for its wine; (Prantsusmaa on



kuulus oma veinide poolest)

Our neighbour is notorious for his stinginess.  
(Meie naaber on kurikuulus oma kitsiduse poolest).

## 71. 'Afraid'

The adjective 'afraid' may be followed by either the preposition 'of' or 'for', depending on the meaning. 'To be afraid of' means 'to fear somebody or something':

Don't be afraid of the dog. It isn't a savage one  
(Ärge koera kartke. Ta pole kuri).

Many animals are afraid of thunder (Paljud loomad  
kardavad äikest).

But 'to be afraid for' means 'to be anxious about somebody or something':

The river isn't dangerous here and Tim is a good swimmer anyhow. You needn't be afraid for him (Teil ei tarvitse tema pärast karta).

Dad has been working very hard lately, and we are all afraid for his health (Me kardame tema tervise pärast).

## Prepositions indicating time and direction

## 72. 'Till', 'until'

Every student is acquainted with the prepositions 'till' and 'until', which have the same meaning and can in most cases be used interchangeably. Thus we can either say:

We waited till five o'clock

or: We waited until five o'clock (Me ootasime kuni kella viieni)

There are only two general points that we need to bear in mind.

The first is that 'until' is usually preferred at the head of a sentence or clause:

Until the beginning of the holiday season students can travel at reduced prices (Puhkustehooaja alguseni saavad üliõpilased reisisõa alandatud hinnaga).

The second is that 'till' is more homely and conversational; 'until' is more formal. That is why 'until' is preferred in leisurely, dignified or pompous style. But on the whole, as we see, these two prepositions are fairly easy to use and should not give rise to much doubt. In most cases this is really so, but some students have coined an 'elegant variation' of their own: 'up till', which they prefer to the simple 'till' or 'until'. Unfortunately there is no such compound preposition in English and instead of saying "We waited up till five o'clock" we must content ourselves with one of the two simple alternatives:

We waited till five o'clock

or We waited until five o'clock.

### 73. 'Up to'

This wrong form, 'up till', seems to have arisen on the analogy of 'up to', which mostly serves to indicate direction:

Read up to the bottom of page 43 (Lugege kuni 43. lehekülje lõpuni).

The dog followed us up to the corner of the street (Koer järgnes meile kuni tänavakurgani).

However, in conversational and informal contexts 'up to' can also be used to express a relation of time, especially in conjunction with certain simple adverbs, e.g.:

Up to now there had never been any quarrel between them (Senini ei olnud nad kunagi tülitsenud).

Up to then I had no idea that we had attended the same school (Kuni tolle ajani polnud mul aimugi, et olime käinud ühes koolis).

74. Down to

If the direction points to a lower level, 'down to' is used instead of 'up to':

The forest extends right down to the bank of the river (Metsa ulatub kuni jõekaldani)

Some girls wear their hair very long, down to the middle of their backs (Mõned tütarlapsed, kannavad väga pikki juukseid, kuni poole seljani).

75. 'As far as'

Distance is also expressed by the prepositional phrase 'as far as', which for some reason is very seldom used by Estonian students, e.g.:

He accompanied me as far as the bus stop (Ta saatis mind bussipeatuseni);

or: Read as far as page 43 (Lugege kuni 43. leheküljeni).

76. 'Since' or 'from'

Next I should like to draw your attention to a certain broad distinction that exists between the prepositions 'since' and 'from' which may be followed by the adverb 'on' or 'onwards'. 'Since' covers the whole interval of time between the past moment or event mentioned and the moment of speaking. Thus it is always related to the 'Speaker's present', and should normally be followed by one of the perfect tenses:

Fanny has been ill since last Friday (Fanny on juba möödunud reedest saadik haige, i.e. she fell ill on



Friday and has been ill all the time up to the present moment (from the speaker's point of view).

I hadn't met Bill since 1958 (Ma ei olnud Billi kohanud 1958. aastat saadik, i.e. I had not met Bill during the whole period between 1958 and the moment of speech).

On the other hand 'from', which may or may not be followed by 'on' or 'onwards', simply indicates the starting-point of an action or state which both began and ended in the past from the point of view of the speaker, and is not regarded as continuing up to the moment of speech:

From 1962 he studied at the Polytechnical Institute and last spring he graduated with honours (1962. aastast alates õppis ta Polütehnilises Instituudis ja lõpetas mõõdukas kehtel klitusega).

Here it is quite clear that the action of the verb is not regarded as extending up to the moment of speech.

Or take one more example:

From that day on they became close friends (Sel-  
lest päevast peale said nad headeks sõpradeks).

This sentence does not tell us whether the persons mentioned are still friends at the moment of speaking. We do not even know whether they are still alive. If we want to suggest that they are still friends from the point of view of the speaker's present we must use the preposition 'since' and change the tense:

Since that day they have been close friends;

or if the moment of speech is in the past:

Since that day they had been close friends.

Note, please, the use of the tenses here. 'Since' calls for one of the perfect tenses, and implies that the action of the verb lasts right up to, and is still continuing, at the moment of speech. But 'from', which merely marks the starting-point of an action in the past, requires an indefinite tense.

#### 77. The tense with 'since'

In this connection I ought to warn you once more against a typical mistake that many of the Estonian students are inclined to make in sentences like the foregoing. Since the present tense is used in Estonian, they feel implied to use the same tense in English, and when asked to translate such a sentence as "Sellest päevast saadik on nad suured sõbrad", they come out with the incorrect, word-for-word rendering:

Since that day they are close friends.

This is a bad mistake. As we have seen, the correct tense here is not the Present Indefinite, but the Present Perfect:

Since that day they have been close friends.

#### 78. 'For' expressing duration

Another point I should like to make concerns the preposition 'for'. All of our students know that as a preposition of time it expresses duration:

We lived in the country for many years (Me elasime maal palju aastaid).

I worked on the article for three days (Ma töötasin artikli kallal kolm päeva).

We had to wait for a long time before the doctor received us (Me pidime ootama kaua aega enne kui arst meid vastu võttis).

So accustomed are our students to using 'for' in such contexts that they overlook the fact that in nine cases out of ten the preposition can be safely omitted and we can simply say:

We lived in the country many years;  
and I worked on the article three days;  
and We had to wait a long time before the doctor received us.

I have noticed that when secondary-school children leave out 'for' some of our student-teachers feel unsure of themselves and, more often than not, insist on the preposition being added, 'just in case'. As we have seen, both variants are quite correct and in most cases there is no need to interfere.

Certainly there are occasions when it seems less advisable to dispense with the preposition, especially when there is any idea of purpose or futurity:

Would you mind looking after the baby for a few minutes while I go to the shops (Kas te ei vaataks hetkeks lapse järele, kuni mina poes ära käin).

But even here the 'for' is not absolutely necessary, and omission could certainly not be regarded as a mistake.

#### 79. 'Time'

On the other hand, this preference of our students for the preposition 'for' has led to a real blunder which is very wide-spread and so deeply rooted that it has proved very difficult to eradicate. Probably on the analogy of such phrases as 'for many years', 'for three days' etc. and above all 'for a long time' many students have fallen into the habit of using the preposition 'for' with the word 'time' when it stands in the plural. It is quite common to hear such sentences as:



I've told you for many times that you shouldn't take my things without asking me (Ma olen sulle palju kordi öelnud, et sa ei tohi ilma küsimata minu asju võtta).

or We went there for three times before we found him in (Me käisime seal kolm korda enne, kui ta kodunt leidsime).

Here we should do well to remember that 'for' expresses duration, not repetition (which is implied by the plural form 'times'). So using the word in the singular we can either say 'a long time' or 'for a long time', but with the plural form 'times' 'for' is always wrong and we can only say 'many times', 'three times', etc. The correct versions of the above examples would therefore be:

I've told you many times that you shouldn't take my things without asking me.

and We went there three times before we found him in.

The preposition 'for' is usually also present when order is expressed ('for the first (second, third etc.) time'. Note that in all these expressions the word 'time' stands in the singular:

How old were you when you went to the theatre for the first time? (Kui vanalt te käisite esimest korda teatris?)

I'm in this town for the third time, so I can show you all the sights (Ma olen siin linnas kolmandat korda).

#### 80. 'Late', 'early'

Another mistake in the use of the preposition 'for' occurs in connection with the adjectives 'late' and 'early'. Here the preposition 'for' is used to denote the place at which one arrives late or early, but not to express a

period, of time, i.e. to indicate exactly how late or early we are. Thus we can say:

The boy was late for school. (Poiss jäi kooli hiljaks);

or We were early for the theatre (Me jõudsime teatrisse liiga vara).

But we cannot say:

The train was late for half an hour

or We were early for twenty minutes.

Here the only possible constructions are:

The train was half an hour late (Rong hilines pool tundi)

and We were twenty minutes early (Me jõudsime kakskümme minutit varem).

#### 81. 'In' expressing duration

Another preposition of time which sometimes gives rise to difficulties is the preposition 'in'. One of its functions is to express duration, e.g.:

The secretary typed the letter out in five minutes (Sekretär tippis kirja ümber viie minutiga, or: viie minuti jooksul, i.e. sekretäril kulus viis minutit kirja ümber tippimiseks).

This application of 'in' is clear enough to the vast majority of students and mistakes are seldom or never made.

#### 82. 'In' or 'after'?

But unfortunately 'in' has also another meaning, that of 'after' or 'on the expiration of a certain period of time'. Here we should remember that in this sense 'in' usually refers to the future with regard to the moment of

speech, e.g.:

Father has left for Tallinn. He'll return in a fortnight (Isa sõitis Tallinna. Ta tuleb tagasi kahe nädala pärast; i.e. at the end of a fortnight counting from the moment of speech).

John took his cap and went out saying that he would be back in a quarter of an hour (John võttis mütsi ja läks välja öeldes, et veerand tunni pärast on ta tagasi, i. e. a quarter of an hour after making the remark).

On the other hand, when we refer to something that happened in the past after some other past moment or event, we should either use the preposition 'after' or the adverb 'later', but not 'in', as some students seem to think. Thus we are on safer ground when we say:

It was rather cold when we arrived in the mountains, but after a few days the weather changed.

or: It was very cold when we arrived in the mountains, but a few days later the weather changed (Kui me mägedesse jõudsime, oli väga külm, aga mõne päeva pärast ilm muutus)

or, to take one more example:

Preparations were begun early in spring and after three months everything was ready for the expedition;

or: Preparations were begun early in spring and three months later everything was ready for the expedition (Ettevalmistusi alustati varakevadel ja kolme kuu pärast oli ekspeditsiooniks kõik valmis).

True, the use of 'in' in such cases cannot be treated as a downright blunder, and examples may occur in literature from time to time. But it carries with it an idea of intention or futurity of action which is often quite out



of place.

83. 'In' or 'on' to express time of the day

With words denoting the time of the day (morning, afternoon, evening, night) the preposition 'in' is used when they are not limited by any attribute. But when there is an attribute either preceding or following them, the correct preposition is 'on'. Compare the pairs:

The ship sailed in the morning .

The ship sailed on the morning of the fifth of September.

We shall arrive in Riga in the afternoon.

We arrived in Riga on a rainy afternoon.

We shall go to the theatre in the evening.

I heard the opera on the evening when the guest singers from Riga were here.

We heard some strange noises in the night.

The burglary was committed on the night of Richard's arrival.

84. 'By' or 'at' to express a point in time

When the verbs 'be', 'go' or 'come' are followed by an adverbial modifier of place we should not always use the preposition 'by' to indicate a point in time by which something has to be done. The best preposition here is usually 'at':

I must be at the university at nine o'clock today  
(Ma pean tana kella üheksaks ülikoolis olema).

She promised to come to the cafe at two o'clock  
(Ta lubas kella kaheks kohvikusse tulla)

Actually, from a purely theoretically point of view, 'by' is possible in all these cases. But it carries with it the

idea of some kind of protracted activity which is to be brought to completion at a given point of time:

I shall be through with my work by five (Saan oma tõõga kella viieks valmis);

or of something that may happen at any time up to a given moment:

He promised to drop in by five (Ta lubas enne kella viit sisse astuda).

If we do not wish to express either of these two ideas, we should be well advised to stick to 'at', which may be regarded as the normal or standard preposition in such cases.

### Synonymous prepositions

#### 85. 'Despite'

Every student of English knows the preposition 'in spite of' and is capable of using it correctly; but it is surprising how many students make the mistake of coining the spurious, parallel form 'despite of'. There is no such compound, and if we are reluctant to use the normal expression 'in spite of', we must fall back on the simple preposition 'despite', which formerly sounded just a trifle more affected in tone, but has since been more widely popularised by the newspapers. Thus we can either say:

The weather was warm in spite of the wind  
or The weather was warm despite the wind (Tuulest hoolimata oli ilm soe).

#### 86. 'In spite of' or 'irrespective of'?

Sometimes, however, Estonian students overwork the preposition 'in spite of' by using it wrongly as a substitute for 'irrespective of'. This is due to the fact that

the Estonian translation is the same in both cases (millestki hoolimata, millelegi vaatamata). But care should be taken to preserve the distinction in English. 'In spite of' implies that something is done against expectation, and regardless of a certain opposition. 'Irrespective of', on the contrary, suggests that what follows is regarded as irrelevant and is simply not taken into account. Thus we should say:

All Soviet citizens have the right to vote irrespective of their nationality or education (Kõigil nõukogude kodanikel on õigus valida vaatamata nende rahvusele ja haridusele).

All those who were interested could join the art club irrespective of whether they had any preliminary training or not (Hoolimata eelnevast ettevalmistusest).

In both examples 'in spite of' would be quite wrong. On the other hand there is no reason why we should say:

My brother joined the advanced group in spite of his poor knowledge of English. He hoped to catch up with the others by working hard. (Vend astus edasi-jõudnute rühma hoolimata oma nõrgast inglise keele oskusest).

Here we recognise that it was not the sort of thing we should expect a normal person to do if his English was not up to standard.

#### 87. 'Out of'

Another false compound of fairly frequent occurrence in the lecture-room is 'out from'. No such combination exists in standard English. The correct forms are 'from' and 'out of', both of which correspond to the Estonian Elative Case. They are by no means interchangeable, but



since they are rarely a source of error we need not go into further details here. All we have to remember is that we should take care to use the correct form 'out of' in such sentences as

The cat jumped out of the window (Kass hüppas aknast välja);

or The children ran out of the gate (Lapsed jooksid väravast välja).

In American, colloquial style 'out' is sometimes used without the 'of', e.g.:

The cat jumped out the window.

But in England this has a slightly vulgar, semi-literate flavour which prevents us from recommending it for general use.

#### 88. 'Among' or 'out of'

Sometimes hesitation arises in connection with the choice between 'of' or 'out of', or more rarely 'from among', and the simple preposition 'among' or 'amongst'. All of these are usually rendered in Estonian by the Elative case. Here the distinction lies in the idea of inclusion in or exclusion from some total number of persons or things. When we say

Among all the football teams that played yesterday ours was best (Kõigist eile mänginud jalgpallimeeskondadest oli meie oma kõige parem)

we mean that a number of teams played yesterday, including our own team, which turned out to be the best of all.

But: Of (or Out of, sometimes also From among) the eight teams which will be taking part in the next round only four played yesterday (Kaheksast järgmis-

sest voorust osavõtvast meeskonnast mängisid eile ainult neli);

i.e. of the total number of eight teams, four of them played but the other four did not, or in other words were deducted or excluded from the total.

Here are two more examples:

Jenny was among (or amongst) the first to arrive (Jenny oli esimeste saabujata hulgas), i.e. Jenny was included among the first who arrived.

Of (or Out of) the visitors we had expected only Jenny failed to turn up (Oodatud külaliste hulgast jäi ainult Jenny tulemata), i.e. Jenny was excluded from those who arrived.

#### 89. 'Among' or 'between'?

Now for a brief reference to the distinction between the prepositions 'among' and 'between'. Every student is familiar with the general rule that 'between' is used when referring to two persons or things, and 'among' when we refer to more than two. This, however, is not always the case and 'between' may also refer to more than two parties when they are considered separately or individually, e.g.:

A treaty concluded between all the nuclear powers would be of vital importance for the whole of mankind (Kõigi tuumariikide vahel sõlmitav leping oleks kogu inimkonnale elulise tähtsusega).

'Between' is called for here since each of the signatories, or powers in question, would act in its own name. Similarly:

I found some dried flowers between the leaves of the book you gave me (Ma leidsin teie käest saadud raamatu lehtede vahelt kuivatatud lilli).

Each given flower was inserted between two pages of the book. As we see in all such cases the Estonian translation is 'vahel', and not 'hulgas'.

90. 'Popular', 'popularity'

There is, however, one more English preposition that can be translated by 'hulgas' or 'seas' into Estonian. This is the preposition 'with' following the words 'popular' and 'popularity'. Most Estonian students are inclined to use the preposition 'among' which normally corresponds to the postpositions used in their own language. 'Among' is, perhaps, not altogether wrong. But the best idiomatic translations of such Estonian sentences as

Suusatamine on meie õpilaste seas väga populaarne,

or Noor näitlejanna saavutas testripubliku hulgas kiiresti suure populaarsuse,  
are unquestionably the following:

Skiing is very popular with our schoolchildren,  
and The young actress quickly won wide popularity with the theatre-going public.

91. 'Including' and 'included'

The two prepositions 'including' and 'included' have the same meaning. We only have to remember that 'including' precedes the noun or nouns it refers to, whereas 'included' stands after it:

All the inhabitants of the town took part in the celebrations, including the old people and children.

All the inhabitants of the town took part in the celebrations, the old people and children included.



Verbs used in several different  
constructions

There are certain verbs which can be followed by different prepositions, though there is usually a slight difference in the meaning.

92. 'To think'

First let us take the verb 'think', which can be followed by either the preposition 'about' or the preposition 'of', in the sense of 'millelegi mõtlema'. On the whole the more common preposition of the two is probably 'about', especially when we view the action expressed by the verb as a process:

What were you thinking about? You didn't even notice me come in (Mille peale sa mõtlesid? Sa isegi ei märganud, kui ma sisse tulin).

She often thought about her son and wondered whether he was really as happy as he said in his letters (Ta mõtles sageli oma poja peale, et kas ta on ikka tõesti nii õnnelik, nagu ta oma kirjades ütleb).

In such sentences 'of' is also possible, but it nearly always implies a slight distinction in the meaning or context:

What were you thinking of? It must have been something nice. (Mille peale sa mõtlesid? See oli ilmselt midagi meeldivat).

She often thought of her son and wondered whether he was really as happy as he said in his letters.

The difference here is partly a difference of stress.

When we use 'about' the stress is mainly on the verb itself but when we use 'of' we are more interested in the object of the verb. The question "Millele sa mõtlesid?" may be translated in both ways. But if we say "What were you thinking about?" we mean "Mille üle sa parajasti mõtteid mõlgutasid?" or "murdsid pead"; whereas "what were you thinking of?" means rather "Millega su mõtted tegelesid?" or "Mis oli sul südame peal?"

In the second case - "Ta mõtles sageli oma pojale" - there is no change in context, but the ideas expressed are not quite the same. We say "She often thought about her son", when we mean she often worried about him (Tema mõtted viibisid sageli poja juures), while "She often thought of her son" implies simply that she often called him to mind (Poeg tuli talle sageli meelde).

In the sense of 'to have an opinion about something' (in Estonian 'mõtlema, arvama'), or 'to intend to do something' (in Estonian 'mõtlema, kavatsema'), or 'to occur to somebody' (in Estonian 'mõtlema, pähe tulema') the correct preposition is always 'of':

What do you think of this proposal? (Mis sa sellest ettepanekust mõtled? or: Mis sa sellest ettepanekust arvad?)

I told him what I thought of his plan (Ma ütlesin talle, mis ma tema plaanist mõtlesin, or: arvasin).

I had never thought of becoming a journalist (Ma polnud kunagi mõelnud ajakirjanikuks hakata, or: Mul polnud kunagi kavatsust olnud ajakirjanikuks hakata).

It was clear that Ben didn't even think of changing his attitude (Oli selge, et Ben ei mõelnudki (ei kavatsenudki) oma suhtumist muuta).

We had never thought of the possibility that he might fail to turn up (Me polnud kunagi mõelnud võimalusele (meile polnud kunagi pähe tulnud võimalus).

et ta võiks jätta tulemata).

How strange that none of us had ever thought of that simple solution (Kui imelik, et keegi meist polnud kunagi mõelnud sellele lihtsale lahendusele, or: Kui imelik, et kellelegi meist polnud see lihtne lahendus pähe tulnud).

As we see, there are many contexts in which the verb 'think' can only be used with the preposition 'of'. But unfortunately many of our students have fallen into the habit of using 'about' indiscriminately, without regard to the shade of meaning, and as a result, mistakes are liable to creep in.

### 93. 'To speak' and 'talk' about or of?

Much the same is true of the verbs 'speak' and 'talk', both of which can also be followed by either 'about' or 'of' (millestki rääkima). Here it may sometimes be slightly more difficult to draw a clear distinction between the two than in the case of 'think'. However, the following broad rule might be kept in mind: when we wish to imply, that something is discussed, the preposition is 'about', when we simply mention it, the preposition is 'of'.

Everybody was speaking about the Olympic Games (Kõik rääkisid olümpiamängudest, or: Kõik arutasid olümpiamänge).

It took me some time to understand what they were, speaking about (Läks pisut aega enne kui ma taipasin, millest, nad räägivad (mida nad arutavad)).

But: He had never spoken of his intention of going to sea (Ta polnud kunagi rääkinud oma kavatsusest (maininud oma kavatsust) merele minna).

We spoke of many things while we waited for the train (Rongi oodates rääkisime paljudest asjadest, (i.e. we touched upon them briefly)).



Since the basic meaning of 'talk' is 'to converse' or 'to discuss', the preposition 'about' is suitable in the vast majority of cases, while 'of' usually implies that the conversation is more perfunctory.

Little Johnny never tired of talking about his first trip to seaside (Väike Johnny ei väsinud kunagi rääkimast oma esimesest reisist mere äärde).

It was so pleasant to remember our student days and talk about the things we had done together (Oli nii meeldiv meenutada ülikoolipäevi ja rääkida sellest, mis me üheskoos olime teinud).

Here, we might also use the preposition 'over':

It was so pleasant to remember our student days and talk over the things we had done together.

But: They sat down for a moment and talked of the weather (Nad võtsid hetkeks istet ja rääkisid ilmast).

Naturally very often both prepositions are possible:

She dropped in at my flat every now and again and we talked of (or: about) our mutual acquaintances (Ta astus vahetevahel minu poole sisse ja me rääkisime oma ühistest tuttavatest).

#### 94. 'To say about' or 'of'?

Much the same distinctions are valid for the verb 'say', as the following examples will help to make clear:

At first the chairman said a few words about the activities of the circle during the term (Algul rääkis juhataja mone sõnaga ringi tööst semestri väl- tel).

True, he said something about giving up his job, but I didn't take him seriously (Tõsi, ta ütles küll midagi töölt ära minemise kohta).

In these two cases the word needed is 'about', and 'of' would be wrong. But in other cases both are possible, and we must distinguish between them. Let us take, for example, the following sentences:

This author's poems are rather difficult to read and the same can be said of his novels (Selle autori luuletusi on küllalt raske lugeda ja sedsama võib öelda tema romaanide kohta).

Here 'about' is also possible, though it has a slightly more colloquial flavour.

Then again:

William talked a lot, but he said nothing of his plans for the future (William rääkis palju, kuid ta ei öelnud midagi oma tulevikukavatsuste kohta).

Here, too, we might have used 'about', but in so doing we should have changed the meaning: 'he said nothing of his plans' means that he did not mention them; 'but he said nothing about his plans' means that he gave no particulars concerning them.

In connection with the verb 'to say' we should also remember that the prepositional object introduced by 'about' or 'of' is always preceded by some sort of direct object such as 'a few words', 'something' etc., as we can see from the examples above.

## 95 'To say to'

Lastly, we should be very careful when translating from Estonian into English. In all of the foregoing sentences the normal Estonian construction is: "millegi kohta midagi ütles". But this expression is also used in the meaning of 'to think' or 'to have an opinion'. In this case the correct English equivalent is 'to say something to something':

What did he say to your proposal? (Mis ta teie ettepaneku kohta ütles? or: Mis ta teie ettepanekust arvas?)

David suggested that we should stay for another three days. What do you say to that? (Mis sa selle kohta (sellest) arvad?)

What would you say to having lunch first and going for a walk afterwards? (Mis sa sellest arvad, kui enne einestaksime ja alles siis läheksime jalutama?)

96. 'To talk' as transitive verb

In connection with the verb 'talk' it is useful to remember that, quite unlike Estonian usage, it can also be followed by a direct object in a number of set phrases where a certain narrow sphere of interest or field of activity is in question (e.g. to talk politics, philosophy, art, literature, football, etc.):

Aunt Emma's acquaintances talk art and literature most of the time (Tädi Emma tuttavad räägivad enamasti kunstist ja kirjandusest).

I can't stand people who talk politics all the time (Ma ei talu inimesi, kes räägivad kogu aeg ainult poliitikast).

Here also belongs the common idiom 'to talk shop', which means 'erialalist juttu ajama, mis teisi ei huvita':

Whenever two or three people of the same profession get together they often find themselves talking shop (Kui kaks või kolm sama elukutsega inimest saavad kokku, räägivad nad sageli oma tööst).

The same construction is found in the phrases 'to talk nonsense' and 'to talk sense'. The first of these - 'rumalusi rääkima' - is used in exactly the same way in



Estonian, but the only possible equivalent for the latter is 'mõistlikult rääkima', where we have to use an adverb instead of the noun we have in English, e.g.:

Please stop talking nonsense and try to talk sense once in a while (Palun jäta rumaluste rääkimine ja püüa vahel ka mõistlikult rääkida).

97. 'To speak' and 'talk' with or to?

Another point I should like to make in connection with the verbs 'speak' and 'talk' is the choice of the preposition in the meaning of 'kellegagi rääkima'. Since the Comitative Case is used here in Estonian, most of our students naturally use the corresponding English preposition 'with'. We cannot call this a mistake, as 'with' is formally correct and may even be found in print now and then. But we should bear in mind that, in the vast majority of cases, idiomatic usage prefers 'to':

Who do you want to talk to? (kellega te tahate rääkida?)

I can't say anything definite yet. I must first talk to my parents (Ma ei saa veel midagi kindlat öelda. Ma pean enne vanematega rääkima).

I should like to speak to the Headmaster (Ma tahaksin kooli direktoriga rääkida).

Have you spoken to the new lab assistant yet? (Kas te uue laborandiga olete juba rääkinud?)

When the preposition 'with' is used in this sense, it implies that the talking goes on for a considerable time or that somebody is engaged in the act of speaking at a given moment:

Do you know the man who is speaking with the Manager? (Kas te tunnete seda meest, kes praegu juhatajaga räägib?)

or: Sorry I couldn't ring you up before. My sister was talking with one of her friends and I couldn't interrupt her (Kahjuks ma ei saanud sulle varem helistada. Mu õde rääkis ühe sõbrannaga ja ma ei saanud teda katkestada).

But even in such cases most English people would prefer to use 'to' and say:

Do you know the man who is speaking to the Manager?

and: Sorry I couldn't ring you up before. My sister was talking to one of her friends and I couldn't interrupt her.

98. 'To ask' of or from?

In the meaning of 'küsimine' the most common construction for the verb 'to ask' is to be followed by two direct objects - 'to ask somebody something':

The teacher asked us many questions (Õpetaja esitas meile palju küsimusi).

If the object expressing the person who is asked something happens to be a long one, especially when it is qualified by an attribute, we have to place it second in order to preserve the balance of the sentence. In such cases we have to use a preposition, and the correct preposition is 'of', not 'from', as the corresponding Estonian usage might seem to suggest:

He asked the same question of everybody he happened to discuss the matter with (Ta esitas sama küsimuse kõigile, kellega ta seda asja juhtus arutama).

99. 'To demand', 'require', 'expect':

Similarly, the preposition 'of' (and not 'from') is

used to introduce the personal object following the verbs 'demand', 'require' and 'expect':

That is all that is required of you (See on kõik, mis teilt nõutakse).

A scrupulous observance of the safety regulations is demanded of all those who go in for mountaineering (Kõigilt alpinismi harrastajalt nõutakse ohutustehnika eeskirjadest täpset kinnipidamist).

Mary and Fred expected great things of their son (Mary ja Fred ootasid pojalt suuri tegusid).

#### 100. 'To ask for'

Another point to remember in connection with the verb 'to ask' is that when it is used in the meaning of 'to request' (in Estonian 'paluma'), it should be followed by the preposition 'for':

He asked me for my fountain-pen (Ta palus mult täitesulepead).

May I ask you for another of those nice cakes of yours? (Kas ma tohin paluda veel ühe neist maitsvatest kookidest?)

On the other hand 's 'for' is usually omitted when it is followed by a second object in the form of a prepositional phrase. Thus we say:

You'd better ask for permission (Teil oleks parem luba küsida).

But: If you want to smoke, you must ask permission of the ladies that are present (Kui te tahate suitsetada, peate daamidelt luba paluma).

#### 101. 'To ask' needs a personal object

Now that we are discussing the verb 'to ask' I should like to draw your attention to one more mistake which is



often made by Estonians in this connection, though it has nothing to do with prepositions. In sentences where 'ask' is followed by an infinitive, it is pretty common in Estonian to have no personal object at all. So while in Estonian we can say just the same as in English:

Õpetaja palus mind (or: meid, or: teid etc.) uks sulgeda;

we can also simply say:

Õpetaja palus uks sulgeda,

when it is clear from the context who is expected to do it. As a result Estonian students often use the same construction in English and say:

The teacher asked to close the door.

Unfortunately, that is quite wrong, as in English we need both the objects, and the personal object cannot be dispensed with. If it is missing in Estonian, it must be supplied in English. Thus we must say:

The teacher asked me (or us, or you, or him etc.) to close the door.

Let us take a few more examples:

Mees palus kirji tema sõbrale üle anda (The man asked me (or him, or her, or us etc.) to hand the letter over to his friend).

Naine palus aidata tal kohver alla võtta (The woman asked us (or them - her fellow-passengers) to help her to take down her suitcase).

We can only dispense with the personal object if we use a for-phrase with the Passive Infinitive:

The teacher asked for the door to be closed.

The man asked for the letter to be handed over to his friend.

The woman asked for her suit-case to be taken down.

#### 102. 'To meet'

Another verb which needs a few comments is 'meet'. In Estonian we can either say 'kedagi kohtama' or 'kellegagi kohtuma'. In British English we usually use the direct object when speaking of persons, and the preposition 'with' only when we refer to abstract ideas, things or situations:

I meet Jenny at the library almost every day (Ma kohtan Jennyt raamatukogus peaaegu iga päev).

We met many interesting people at the seaside. (Kuurorordis kohtasime palju huvitavaid inimesi).

But: The expedition met with a number of unexpected obstacles (Ekspeditsioon kohtas rida ootamatuid raskusi).

On the way back from the mountains they met with an accident (Tagasiteel mägedest juhtus neil õnnetus).

In American English, however, this distinction is often not made and the preposition 'with' is frequently used to refer to persons. Thus an American might say:

I meet with Jenny at the library almost every day

or: We met with many interesting people at the seaside.

Nevertheless, when it is used in the meaning of 'correspond' or 'satisfy', the verb 'meet' can only be followed by a direct object as, for example, in the expression 'to meet certain needs, requirements, demands, wishes etc.):

Our industrial output has grown from year to year to meet the growing needs of the population (Meie tööstustoodang kasvab aasta-aastalt, et rahuldada elanikkonna kasvavaid vajadusi).

The performance of this choir is excellent. It should meet the standards of the most exacting listeners. (Selle koori esinemine on oivaline. See peaks rahuldama ka kõige nõudlikuma kuulaja nõudeid).

### 103. 'To believe'

In much the same way the verb 'believe' is followed by a direct object when it is used in the meaning of 'to think or to be of the opinion that something is true'; but by a prepositional object introduced by 'in' when it expresses faith in, or reliance on something. Thus we should say:

I believed his words (Ma uskusin ta sõnu).

The whole story sounds too far-fetched. Nobody is likely to believe you (Kogu see lugu kõlab liiga ebatõenäoline. Ega keegi sind ei usu küll).

But: Religious people believe in God (Usklikud usuvad jumalat)

Although some of Albert's friends had let him down, he still firmly believed in friendship (Sellest hoolimata, et mõned sõbrad olid teda alt vedanud, uskus Albert ikkagi kindlalt sõprusesse).

Perhaps it would not be out of place if we add that when 'believe' (in the first sense) is followed by an object clause in Estonian, in the vast majority of cases this should be rendered by an infinitive in English. Thus the sentence:

Ma tõesti uskusin, et ta oli siis raskesti haige, would become in English:



I really believed him to be seriously ill at the time:

rather than:

I really believed that he was seriously ill at the time.

#### 104. 'To agree'

Next I should like to make a passing reference to the verb 'agree', which occasionally gives rise to mistakes when it is used in the sense of 'to consent'. Estonian usage requires the Comitative Case here ('kelle-gagi või millegagi nõustuma'). But in English a distinction is usually made: 'to agree with' means 'to hold the same views' or 'to be of the same opinion'; whereas 'to agree to' means 'to assent to something', 'to give one's consent to something', 'to accept a proposal'. E.g.:

I quite agree with you (Olen teiega täiesti päri).

Peter admired his elder brother and always agreed with him (Peeter imetles oma vanemat venda ja oli temaga alati nõus).

I'm afraid I can't agree with you about what you said about Kafka (Kahjuks ei saa ma sellega nõustuda, mis te Kafka kohta ütlesite).

But: They willingly agreed to our proposal (Nad meeleli nõustusid meie ettepanekuga).

You'd better moderate your demands or he may flatly refuse to agree to them (Teil oleks parem oma nõudmisi vähendada või muidu ta võib otseselt keelduda nendega nõustumast).

I have looked through your points, and agree to all of them with the exception of the last two (Ma vaatasin teie nõudmised läbi ja olen nende kõigiga nõus, välja arvatud kaks viimast).

When we are of the same opinion as somebody else we may say that we agree, or have reached an agreement 'on something', never 'in something' as Estonian usage would suggest:

He agreed with me on all the points raised in the course of the discussion (Ta nõustus minuga igas punktis)

Very often the passive construction is used in such sentences

We were agreed on all points (Me olime igas küsimuses ühel arvamusel).

Both parties were agreed on the necessity of taking immediate and decisive measures to improve the situation (Mõlemad pooled olid arvamusel, et on vaja rakendada koheselt otsustavaid abinõusid olukorra parandamiseks).

#### 105. 'To compare'

The verb 'to compare' can be followed by either 'to' or 'with'. 'To' is used to point to a similarity between two persons or things. 'With' is used when two or more things are placed side by side with the object of determining whether they are similar or not:

The human heart can be compared to a pump (Inimese südant võib võrrelda pumbaga)

You can't compare yourself to Shakespeare. He was a great writer and you are only a beginner (Sa ei saa ennast Shakespeare'iga võrrelda)

When you compare the copy with the original, you'll see the difference between them (Koopiat originaaliga võrreldes näete, mille poolest nad erinevad).

By comparing the structure of the English language with that of Estonian, we can get a clear idea of both

their basic similarities and differences (Inglise keele struktuuri eesti keele omaga võrreldes saame selge pildi nende põhilistest sarnasustest ja erinevustest).

#### 106. 'To consist'

A common source of hesitation or misunderstandings is the verb 'to consist', which may be followed by either 'of' or 'in'. Actually the distinction is simple enough. 'To consist of' means, properly speaking, 'to be made up or composed of' (Koosnema):

My family consists of five persons: my father and mother, my two brothers and myself (Mu perekond koosneb viiest inimesest).

The novel consists of two parts (Romaan koosneb kahest osast).

On the other hand 'to consist in' means 'to be', 'to lie in something' or 'to take the form of something' (seisnema, endast kujutama):

Your task as a guide will consist mainly in showing tourists about the town (Giidina teie ülesanne seisneb peamiselt turistidele linna näitamises).

One of the peculiarities of the author's style consists in (or simply 'is') his abundant use of epithets (Üks autori omapärasusi seisneb rohkes epiteetide kasutamises).

#### 107. 'To result'

Another verb which can be used with two different prepositions is 'to result'. 'To result in something' means 'to cause', 'to bring about', 'to have something as a result' or 'to end up in something' (midagi põhjustama):

Columbus's expedition resulted in the discovery



of America (Kolumbuse ekspeditsiooni tulemugeks oli Ameerika avastamine).

Their argument resulted in a quarrel (Nende vaidlustest tekkis tüli).

'To result from something' means 'to arise or come about as a natural consequence' (millestki tulenema):

All the trouble resulted from a misunderstanding (Kogu pahandus oli tekkinud ühest arusaamatusest).

His pneumonia had resulted from a neglected cold (Tema kopsupõletik oli alguse saanud hooletusse jäetud külmetusest).

#### 108. 'To marry'

Quite a number of our students seem to find difficulty in handling the verb 'to marry'. Since Estonian usage requires the Comitative Case (kellegagi abielluma) some people jump to the conclusion that the same idea should be rendered in English with the help of the preposition 'with'. Unfortunately 'with' is always wrong. In English we use a direct object in the Active Voice ('to marry somebody') and the preposition 'to' in the Passive Voice ('to be married to somebody' or 'to get married to somebody'):

Is it true that Bert has married your sister?  
(Kas on tõsi, et Bert abiellus sinu õega?)

As soon as Kate came of age she was married off to a farmer from the neighbouring village (Niipea kui Kate sai täisealiseks, pandi ta ühele naaberküla talunikule mehele).

Helen married a Georgian (or: got married to a Georgian) and went to live in the South (Helen abiellus grusiinlasega ja kolis lõunasse elama).

In the same way, the preposition 'to' is required by

the noun 'marriage':

Helen's marriage to Paul was a happy one (Heleni abielu Pauliga oli õnnelik).

Nobody had suspected anything before Anna's marriage to her cousin was publicly announced (Keegi polnud midagi aimanud, enne kui Anna abiellumine tema onupojaga tehti avalikult teatavaks).

#### I09. 'To oppose'

In precisely the same way the verb 'to oppose' (millelegi vastu olema) takes a direct object in the Active Vasee, but when used in Passive it is followed by the preposition 'to':

I don't think anybody will go so far as to oppose your plan openly (Ma ei usu, et keegi oleks avalikult teie plaani vastu).

I don't think anybody will be openly opposed to your plan.

#### II0. 'To protest'

Closer to Estonian usage is the verb 'protest', which is normally followed by the preposition 'against':

A large crowd gathered outside the American Embassy to protest against this wanton destruction of life and property. (Suur rahvahulk kogunes ameerika saatkonna juurde, et avaldada protesti sellise inimelude ja materiaalsete väärtuste mõttetu hävitamise vastu).

But it is interesting to note that a tendency has recently sprung up in the United States to treat 'protest' as a simple transitive verb whenever it is used in connection with a formal political statement or organised demonstration:

A large crowd gathered outside the American Embassy to protest this wanton destruction of life and property.

It is, perhaps, too early in the day to recommend this construction for general use, as it still carries a rather aggressive American flavour. However, our students should be prepared to meet with it in print, and there are indications that it is beginning to catch up with the newspapers in England, so that the possibility of omitting the preposition should at least be borne in mind.

### III. 'To write'. 'to print' 'to draw'

Some Estonian students tend to use the verbs 'write' 'paint', 'draw' etc. with the preposition 'with' mechanically following the model of the Estonian construction which required the Comitative Case. As a result we come across such blunders as

The letter was written with ink,

The landscape was painted with water-colours, etc.

Actually these verbs can be followed in English by either 'with' or 'in', according to the meaning. But the distinction is an easy one to make. As a general rule, 'with' refers to the instrument or technique employed, whereas 'in' expresses the result obtained. Thus we say that

We draw with a pencil, but paint with a brush (Me joonistame pliiatsiga ja maalime pintsliga).

First children are taught to write with a pencil and only later with pen and ink (Algul õpetatakse lapsi kirjutama pliiatsiga ja alles hiljem sulepea ja tindiga).

In both these sentences the preposition refers to the means or instrument used. But if we are concerned



not with the means, but with the finished object or work of art, we should use the preposition 'in'. Thus the faulty sentences quoted above should be corrected as follows:

The letter was written in ink (Kiri oli kirjutatud tindiga).

The landscape was painted in water-colours (Maastik oli maalitud vesivärvidega).

Here the fact that we are dealing with a finished product is further emphasised by the use of the passive voice. Similarly:

We liked the drawing in crayons best of all (Meile meeldis värviline pliiatsijoonistus kõige enam).

All his best work was done in oil (Kõik ta paremad tööd olid maalitud õlivärvidega).

It is worth while noting that 'in' remains the normal preposition in English in many cases where we should prefer to use the Elative Case in Estonian:

A few small figures carved in ivory and ebony were ranged along the mantelpiece (Kaminasimsil seisis reas mõned elevandiluust ja eebenipuust nikerdatud kujukesed).

#### Synonymous verbs calling for different prepositions

### II2. 'To enter' and 'to come'

A fairly common mistake for Estonians to make is to use the verb 'enter' with the preposition 'into' to

express the idea of Illative Case. The English verb 'enter' can only be followed by a direct object when the idea conveyed is that of simply movement in space:

Everybody stood up when the Headmaster entered the classroom (Kõik tõusid püsti, kui direktor klassi sisse astus).

Of course, if we use the verb 'to come' we must always add the preposition 'into', much the same as in the corresponding Estonian construction:

Kitty came into the room carrying a big bunch of flowers (Kitty astus tuppa, käes suur kimp lilli).

What many students fail to realise, however, is that the verb 'to enter' is also normally followed by the preposition 'into' when abstract ideas are expressed:

I had no wish to enter into an argument with them (Mul polnud tahtmist nendega vaidlusse laskuda).

After the Second World War the people of Africa entered into a fierce struggle against colonialism and many of them have already achieved independence (Aafrika rahvad astusid ägedasse võitlusesse).

Many of our schoolchildren have entered into correspondence with foreign pen-friends (Paljud meie õpilastest on astnud kirjavahetusse välismaiste kirjasõpradega).

Without entering into unnecessary details I should like to discuss the main features of the present situation (Laskumata tarbetuise üksikasjadesse tahaksin arutada praeguse olukorra põhijooni\*)

---

\*Cf. the use of the prepositions 'in' and 'into' with the verb 'to enter' in § 33.

### II3. 'To reach', 'to arrive', 'to get'

Another verb which gives rise to this type of false analogy is 'to reach'. Its Estonian counterpart 'kuhugi jõudma' suggests the preposition 'to'; but the English verb requires a direct object:

The sun had set before we reached our destination (Päike oli juba looja läinud, kui me kohale jõudsime).

The train will reach Moscow early in the morning (Rong jõuab Moskvasse varahommikul).

There are two synonymous verbs which can be used as substitutes for 'to reach': 'to arrive' and 'to get'. The former of these, 'to arrive', usually takes the preposition 'at' to indicate arrival at a point in space, or some small locality, such as a house or village; and the preposition 'in' to indicate a large city, district or country:

The sun had set before we arrived at our destination,  
but: The train will arrive in Moscow early in the morning.

The verb 'to get' can only be followed by a noun preceded by the preposition 'to', or by an adverb:

The sun had set before we got to the camp (Päike oli looja läinud enne kui me laagrisse jõudsime).

The train will get to Moscow early in the morning.

When she got there it was too late (Ta jõudis sinna liiga hilja).

What time did you get home last night? (Mis ajal te eile õhtul koju jõudsite?)



In this connection it might be pointed out that many Estonian students have difficulty in expressing the idea of 'to reach a place in time' (jõudma), without actually mentioning the place itself. Here the correct expressions are "to get there in time", or simply 'to make it'.

The railway station is some way off. If you don't take a taxi you won't make it (Or: you won't get there in time) (Kui te taksot ei võta, siis te ei jõua sinna õigeks ajaks).

"Is there time for a cup of coffee?" - "Time and to spare. The show won't begin till half past five. We'll make it all right" (Me jõuame küll).

#### II4. 'To call' and 'to visit'

The two more or less synonymous verbs 'to call' and 'to visit' require different prepositions in English. These are very often mixed up by Estonians. 'To call' is used in the sense of a short or formal visit. It is followed by 'on' when the object is a person, and by 'at' when the object is a place:

I had to call at a number of offices before I got the matter settled (Ma pidin mitmest instantsist läbi käima enne kui asja korda sain).

When Teddy's birthday came round, the telegram-bearer called on us several times in the course of the day (Telegrammikandja külastas meid päeva jook-sul mitu korda).

The verb 'to visit' is somewhat more formal, but at the same time wider in its application, and may be used to render the Estonian verb 'külastama' in all its connotations. But in spoken English it is decidedly more rare than its less formal equivalent 'to pay somebody a visit', and its colloquial synonyms 'to call' and 'drop in', 'look in', 'step in', etc. It is followed not by a preposition,

but by a direct object which may indicate either person or place:

When I went to Leningrad Max asked me to visit his aunt and hand her over a parcel (Max palus mind oma tãdi külãstada ja talle pakk üle anda).

During the trip we visited a whole number of museums and other places of interest (Oma reisil külãstasime tervet rida muuseumi ja muid huvitavaid kohti).

The corresponding nouns 'call' and 'visit' enter into phrasal verbs which likewise take different prepositions. Thus we pay a call on a person or at a place; but we pay a visit to a person or place:

Whenever Minnie goes to Tallinn she has to pay calls on all her personal acquaintances, for fear of offending them (Kui Minnie käib Tallinnas, peab ta külãstama kõiki sealseid tuttavaid).

This afternoon I intend to pay a call at the hospital to inquire after my friend's health (Tãna õhtupoolikul tahan külãstada haiglat).

It is the dream of every artist to pay at least one visit to Italy (Iga kunstniku unistuseks on vähemalt kordki Itaalias külãstada).

As I had a few minutes to spare I decided to pay a visit to my old form master, who lived only a few doors away (Kuna mul oli mõni minut aega, otsustasin külãstada oma vana klassijuhatajat, kes elas vaid mõni maja eemal).

But a short indirect object is placed before the direct object and as a result the preposition 'to' is not used:

Jenny would be so glad if you could find time to pay her a visit (Jenny'l oleks nii hea meel, kui sa leiaksid aega teda külãstada).

## II5. 'To treat' and 'to deal'

Some confusion arises when handling the two synonymous verbs 'to treat' and 'to deal' (käsitlema). The former requires a direct object; the latter is followed by the preposition 'with':

This problem has been treated by many writers (Paljud kirjanikud on käsitleanud seda probleemi).

Problems of nature conservation are dealt with in the three first articles of the present collection (Looduskaitse probleeme käsitletakse käeseleva kogumiku kolmes esimeses artiklis).

## II6. 'To be sorry', 'to feel sorry', 'to sympathise'

Another group of verbs which are often used with wrong prepositions by Estonians are 'to be sorry', 'to feel sorry' or simply 'to feel', which take the preposition 'for', and 'to sympathise', which takes the preposition 'with':

We were sorry for her, but there was nothing much we could do to help (Meil oli temast kahju, kuid me ei osanud teda eriti aidata).

Although George had brought the trouble on his own head we could not help feeling sorry for him when we saw how miserable he was (Kuigi George oli selle õnnetuse endale ise kaela tõmmanud, oli meil temast paratamatult kahju).

I feel for you more than I can say (Ma ei oska öelda kui kahju mul teist on).

Progressive people all over the world sympathise with the gallant struggle of the small undeveloped countries against the forces of neo-colonialism (Kogu maailma progressiivsed inimesed tunnevad kaasa nõrgaltarenenud väikeriikide vaprale võitlusele neokolonialismi vastu).



Synonymous nouns and adjectives with  
different prepositions

Sometimes mistakes result from confusing the different prepositions which are required by more or less synonymous words.

II7. 'Specialist', and 'expert'

Here belong such nouns as 'specialist', which is used with 'in', and 'expert', which usually requires 'on' when it is followed by a concrete noun:

He is an outstanding specialist in Ancient History (Ta on väljapaistev spetsialist anitiikajaloo alal).

It takes an expert on jewels to distinguish between a real and an artificial one (Ainult ekspert kalliskivide alal oskab vahet teha tõelise ja kunstlikult valmistatu vahel).

II8. 'Enthusiastic', 'rapturous' and 'keen'

A similar pair, though not so sharply differentiated, is made up of the adjectives 'enthusiastic' and 'rapturous'. In modern colloquial English the former nearly always takes the preposition 'about', whereas 'rapturous' usually prefers 'over'. But we should remember that the workaday preposition 'about' is becoming almost universal in conversational style, and is tending to displace the more formal 'over' in this context, just as it is tending to oust the more formal 'of' in phrases like 'to know of', 'speak of', 'talk of', etc. \*) In familiar language 'keen', which requires 'on', is much more common than 'enthusiastic'. 'Rapturous' is rarely used in everyday speech, as it sounds too stilted or 'gushing' for ordinary usage. The constructions recommended are thus:

\* Cf §93.

Larry agreed to do the job, though he wasn't very enthusiastic about it (Larry nõustus ülesannet täitma, olgugi et ta ei olnud sellest eriti vaimustatud).

The children were rapturous over the prospect of being taken to the zoo (Lapsed olid vaimustatud väljavaatest, et neid viiakse loomaaeda).

Well, we could go for a walk instead, though I can't say I should be very keen on it. (Me ju võime selle asemel jalutama minna, kuigi ma ei saa öelda, et ma sellest eriti vaimustatud oleksin).

## II9. 'Enthusiasm' and 'rapture'

The corresponding nouns may also cause hesitation. The noun 'rapture' should be used with the same preposition as the adjective 'rapturous' (i.e. 'over' or in less formal contents 'about'), but 'enthusiasm' requires the preposition 'for':

We had never thought the girl would go into such raptures over the doll (Me polnud arvanudki, et tütarlaps võiks nukust sellisesse vaimustusse sattuda).

Even in America there is now little enthusiasm for the war in Vietnam (Isegi Ameerikas tuntakse nüüd vähe vaimustust sõja vastu Vietnamis).

### Noun and verb with different prepositions

## I20. 'To make somebody's acquaintance'

The prepositions are often confused in English equivalents for 'kellegagi tutvuma'. These are: 1) 'to make the acquaintance of somebody'; 2) to get (or: to become acquainted with somebody); 3) (informally) to get to know somebody; 4) and (formally) to be introduced to somebody

or something. Thus one and the same idea can be expressed in many different ways.

- 1) I made the acquaintance of that girl at a skiing camp (Tutvusin tolle tütarlapsega suusalaagris).

Or, using the Possessive Case:

- I made that girl's acquaintance at a skiing camp.  
2) I got (or: became) acquainted with that girl at a skiing camp.  
3) I got to know that girl at a skiing camp.  
4) I was introduced to her at Kääriku.

This construction may be used in English when the connotation is quite impersonal:

He was introduced to the situation in France by one of the correspondents of a local newspaper.  
(Ta tutvus olukorraga Prantsusmaal ühe kohaliku ajalehe korrespondendi kaudu).

## I2I. 'To resemble'

Estonian students often mistakenly use the verb 'to resemble' with a prepositional object preceded by 'to'. This is possibly due to the fact that the equivalent phrasal verbs 'to have a resemblance' and 'to bear a resemblance' are always followed by the preposition 'to'. The simple verb 'to resemble', however, takes only a direct object. Thus the possible variants are:

The boy bears a striking resemblance to his father  
(Pois sarnaneb silmatorkavalt oma isaga).

Or: The boy has a striking resemblance to his father.

Or: The boy greatly resembles his father.

We need hardly add, perhaps, that there are other alternatives and all of the constructions listed above seem



somewhat formal beside the simple expressions:

He's very (much) like his father,  
He's the (living) image of his father;

not to mention the colloquial idioms:

He's the (very) spit of his !Dad!  
He's a (real) chip of the old block, etc.

## I22. 'To present'

There is much confusion in the use of the prepositions when English equivalents are needed for the Estonian verb 'kinkima'. This idea can be rendered in English in different ways, as a glance at the following examples will make clear:

- 1) The visitors presented badges to all the children who went to meet them (Külalised kinkisid rinnamärgid kõigile lastele kes neile vastu tulid).
- 2) We presented Teacher with a large bunch of flowers (Me kinkisime õpetajale suure kimbu lilli).
- 3) She was so delighted with the brooch that I decided to make her a present of it (Ta oli prossist nii vaimustatud, et otsustasin selle talle kinkida).
- 4) Presents (gifts, donations) of books were made to all those who graduated with honours (Kõigile kiitusega lõpetajalle kingiti raamatud).
- 5) Presents of food and clothing were sent to the stricken areas (Kannatadasaanud piirkondadesse saadeti kingituseks toitu ja riideid).

These examples speak for themselves, and should need no further commentary.

## I23. 'To tour'

We should do well to remember that the English verb

'to tour' is usually followed by a direct object:

Foreign musicians who tour the Soviet Union often visit Tallinn, and sometimes Tartu as well (Nõukogude Liidus ringreisil viibivad välismaa muusikud külastavad sageli Tallinna ja vahel ka Tartut).

However, 'in' is sometimes found, though far less frequently:

He spends most of his time touring in the Mediterranean area (Ta veedab suurema osa ajast reisides Vahemeremaal).

The phrasal verb 'to make a tour' is normally followed by the preposition 'of', whereas 'to go on a tour' perhaps prefers 'in':

Next spring the University Mixed Choir is to make a tour of Latvia and Lithuania (Kevadel goidab ülikooli segakoor ringreisile Lätisse ja Leedusse).

Next summer we shall go on a tour in the Lake District (Suvel läheme reisima Järvede Maale).

#### I24. 'To lecture' and 'lecturer'

The verb 'to lecture', as well as the corresponding noun 'lecture', are used with the preposition 'on':

This well-known professor has lectured on a number of subjects connected with oriental studies (See tuntud professor on pidanud loenguid mitmes orientalistikaga seotud aines).

The guest delivered a very interesting lecture on modern music (Külaline pidas huvitava loengu kaasaegsest muusikast).

But the noun 'lecturer' is usually followed by the preposition 'in':

The author of the book is a lecturer in English literature at Moscow University.

### Nouns used with different prepositions

Besides verbs and the nouns corresponding to them there are other nouns which may be followed by more than one preposition with a smaller or greater difference in the meaning.

#### 125. Works of art or literature

One group of such words is made up of nouns which express the result of some sort of creative activity, e.g. 'picture', 'portrait', 'photo', 'play', 'novel', 'poem' 'book', etc.

Here we can use either 'of' or 'by'. But unfortunately the former preposition is often ambiguous. When we say 'a picture of Picasso' it is not always clear whether we mean a picture painted by Picasso, a picture representing him or a picture belonging to him. The same is true of such expressions as 'Forster's novel' and 'a novel of Forster' or 'a novel of Forster's', etc.

As a general rule, if there is any danger of ambiguity we should prefer the preposition 'by', as we can see from the following pairs:

At the Art Gallery we saw a number of sketches by Picasso (Kunstigaleriis nagime Picasso skitse).

But: Among the exhibits there was a portrait of Picasso (Väljapanekute seas oli Picasso portree, i.e. a portrait representing Picasso).

Similarly:

In yesterday's paper there was a photo by Pat, who is far and away the best amateur photographer at our school (Eilses lehes oli Pati tehtud foto, Pat being



not the subject but the author of the photo).

Compare with this:

In yesterday's paper there was a photo of Pat who is the skiing champion of our school (Eilses lehes oli Pati foto, or: foto Patist, i.e. a photo representing Pat).

Again:

Many books by Lenin were displayed at the exhibition (Näitusel oli välja pandud palju Lenini raamatuid).

But:

At the Lenin museum in Moscow we can see Lenin's books and other personal belongings (Lenini muuseumis Moskyas näeme Lenini raamatuid ja teisi talle kuulunud asju, - in other words books that were not written by him but simply belonged to him).

If it is a case of merely identifying a work of art, we can often dispense with the preposition altogether by using the name of the author in the sense of one of his works. This usage is, of course, common to most European languages, including Estonian.

It is believed to be a genuine Goya (Seda peetakse ehtsaks Goyaks).

Have you seen my Viiralt? (Kas te mu Viiraltit olete näinud?).

Last month the museum acquired an authentic Van Gogh, (Möödunud kuul sai muuseum ehtsa Van Goghi), etc.

In such cases the problem of choosing between 'a painting by someone' or 'a painting of someone' can be neatly

by-passed.

## 126. 'Love' and 'hate'

Perhaps it would not be out of place to add that a similar confusion may arise in connection with such words as 'love' and 'hate'\*, etc., which may revert to the subject or object of the implied word. Thus such a statement as

The love of a beautiful woman was his downfall

may refer either to a man's love for a beautiful woman, or the fact that she was in love with him. Similarly "This hatred of his uncle was the real reason for his declining to come" may mean that either he hated his uncle or his uncle hated him, and if there is any doubt about the matter we should remodel the sentence accordingly.

## 127. 'Beginning' and 'end'

Students often hesitate when they have to choose between 'in' and 'at' with the nouns 'beginning' and 'end'. Here there are really no hard and fast rules to guide us. Usage is largely a question of personal idiom, as the reader will find no lack of exceptions to the generalisations suggested below.

However they may help to simplify matters and relieve the student of a certain amount of perplexity, and we offer them for what they are worth.

As a general rule 'at the beginning' should be preferred to 'in the beginning', which has a slightly biblical flavour that is not always called for. This is specially true when it is followed by an attribute. So we recommend:

Something went wrong at the very beginning (of the performance, etc.).

\* Cf. § 59.

She promised to come at the beginning of next month.

Begin at the beginning if you don't mind (N.B. not "from the beginning", which is not wrong, but less natural in English than its equivalent in Estonian).

As for the companion phrase, both 'in the end' and 'at the end' are common enough, especially the latter. Here we might be advised to make the following simple distinction, which should be regarded more as a hint than as a rule. 'In the end' is an independent phrase which functions as an adverbial modifier of time and means 'at last', 'finally', 'after all' (lõpuks);

In the end everybody was satisfied (Lõpuks olid kõik rahul).

In the end we reached the shelter of a large fir-tree (Lõpuks jõudisime suure kuuse varju).

On the other hand, 'at the end' is usually followed by an attribute introduced by the preposition 'of', and its Estonian translation is accordingly (millegi) 'lõpul';

The conference will be held at the end of next month (Konverents toimud järgmise kuu lõpul).

The poor fellow is at the end of his tether (Vaesekehe jõud on täitsa otsas).

We all signed our names at the end of the letter (Me kõik kirjutasime oma nimed kirja lõppu).

## I28. 'Distance'

Another noun which may be used with either 'in' or 'at' is 'distance'. Here, too, the distinction is an easy one to make and will be found to hold good for all practical purposes. 'In the distance' (note, the definite article) means 'far away', 'a long way off' (kauguses),



and is never modified by any following phrase:

At last the lights of the town appeared in the distance. (Viimaks hakkasid kauguses linna tuled paistma).

Some shots were heard in the distance (Kauguses kolmasid püssipaugud).

On the other hand, 'at the distance' (note the indefinite article) means 'viewed from a certain distance', 'not too near', e.g.:

The picture looks better at a distance (Pilt paistab kenam eemalt vaadatuna).

Secondly 'at a distance' is always called for when an 'of'-phrase follows by way of an attribute (millegi kaugusel), when some point of departure is implied. Moreover, as we have already seen, the definite article is used with the preposition 'in' (in the distance), but the indefinite article with 'at' (at a distance of ...):

He lives at a considerable distance (i.e. from here) (Ta elab kaunis kaugel).

The explosion was heard at a distance of 30 kilometres (Plahvatust oli kuulda kolmekümne kilomeetri kaugusele).

The railway station is at a distance of three miles from the village (Raudteejaam on külast kolme miili kaugusel).

It will be noted that in the last two examples the whole phrase 'at a distance' may be omitted, though this is never the case with 'in the distance':

The explosion was heard 30 kilometres away.

The railway station is three miles from the village.

## "Unpopular" prepositional constructions

In English there are a number of prepositional constructions which are hardly ever used by the average Estonian student for the simple reason that they are not suggested by any analogy with the corresponding Estonian usage.

In this connection attention should be drawn to a few applications of the preposition 'in', since they are seldom used, and when they are needed some sort of mistake is liable to creep in.

### I29. Colour

The preposition 'in' is often used to refer to the colour of materials or articles of clothing:

This hat is blue, but I should like something in green (... mina aga tahaksin rohelist värvi (or: rohelist värvilist))

These cardigans are available in black, white, red and yellow (Need jakid on saadaval mustas, valges, punases ja kollases toonis).

### I30. 'To dress', 'cover', etc.

The verbs 'dress', 'clothe', 'array', 'muffle', 'wrap', 'cover', 'upholster' and a few others also require the preposition 'in' (not 'into' or 'with'):

The lady was dressed in grey (Daam oli riietatud halli).

She loved winter, when the roads were deep in snow and the fields were clothed in white (...ja põllud on rüütatud valgesse).

In a corner of the workshop stood a tailor's dummy draped in black velvet (Ateljee nurgas seisis mannekeen, millele oli must samet ümber mähitud).

She hardly recognised George who was muffled in

a thick woollen scarf (... kellele oli paks villane sall kaela ümber mähitud).

The parcel was wrapped in tissue-paper (Pakk oli mähitud siidpaberisse).

The furniture was covered in flowered chintz for for the summer (Suveks oli mööbel kaetud lillalise sitsiga).

The armchairs were upholstered in brown leather (Tugitoolid olid polsterdatud pruuni nahaga)

### I31. 'In' meaning 'as to'

The preposition 'in' is used to specify some distinctive feature or quality which is referred to as a basis of comparison, classification or qualification. In this sense it carries the meaning of 'as to', 'in regard to', 'in respect of'.

The girl resembles her mother in appearance, but not in character (Tütarlaps sarnaneb emale välimuselt, mitte aga iseloomult).

The castle was Gothic in style, though many details were of later origin (Loss oli gooti stiilis).

The novel is realistic in treatment (Romaan on käsituslaadilt realistlik).

This coat doesn't fit you. It is wide in the shoulders, but tight in waist (Ta on õlgadest lai ja pihast kitsas).

### I32. Quantity

The preposition 'in' serves to denote units of quantity:

The girls strolled along the walks in twos and threes (Tütarlapsed jalutasid teeradadel kahe- ja kolmekaupä).

The guests stood chatting on the lawn in groups



of five or six (Külalised seisisid murul vesteldes viievõi kuue- inimeseliste gruppidenä).

In England distance is measured in miles, on the Continent it is measured in kilometres (Inglismaal mõõdetakse kaugust miljidega, kontinendil aga kilomeetritega).

His supporters turned up in hundreds (or: by the hundred) (Ta poolehoidjaid tuli kohale sadade viisi) (or sadasid).

The rain fell on the window-pane in large drops (Vihm langes aknaruutudele suurte piiskadenä).

He emptied his glass in a single gulp (Ta tühjendas klaasi ainsa söömuaga).

Joan lingered over her ice-cream, nibbling round the edges in the smallest of mouthfuls (Joan sõi jäätist hästi aeglaselt, näksides seda ümber äärte õige väikeste suutäite haaval).

### I33. 'To want'

Another construction which is rarely used by Estonian students is the verb 'want' followed by a prepositional object introduced by the preposition 'with' in the meaning of (kellestki, millestki) 'midagi tahtma':

I wonder what she should want with the gardeners. She knows there aren't any flowers as yet (Ei tea, mis ta aednikust peaks tahtma).

What do you want with my children? Leave them alone. (Mis te mu lastest tahate?)

What do you want with my motor-bike, you young scamps. You know you can't ride it, You'd only hurt yourselves (Mis te võrukaelad, mu mootorrattast tahate? (i.e. Jätke mu mootorrattas rahule)).

### I34. Basis for recognition

When we wish to point out a distinctive quality or

feature from which a certain conclusion is to be drawn the preposition we need is 'by':

You'll recognise him by his limp (Te tunnete ta ära lonkamisest), i.e. selle järgi, et ta lonkab).

We could tell by his face, that something had happened (Me saime ta näost aru, et midagi oli juhtunud).

I know him only by sight (Ma tunen teda ainult välimuse järgi).

We realised by his voice that he was angry (Tema häälest taipasime et ta on pahane).

### 135. 'About' expressing manner or appearance

Another case which may be a cause of perplexity is the choice of preposition when we wish to express some characteristic feature of a person's manner or appearance. The preposition we need here is 'about':

There was something strange about the man's behaviour (Mehe käitumises oli midagi kummalist);

There was something very graceful about the girl's movements (Tütarlapse liigutustes oli midagi väga graatsilist);

There was something familiar about the whole place (Kogu selles paigas oli midagi väga tuttavat);

There was something menacing about his expression (Tema ilmes oli midagi ähvardavat).

As we see in Estonian we mostly use the Innesive Case in such sentences, though sometimes the postposition 'juures' is also possible:

There is something attractive about her (Tema, or tema juures, on midagi võluv).

### 136. 'To live', 'leave', 'stay'

In other contexts, however, the Estonian postpositions

'juures' and 'juurde' call for different translations, some of which do not seem to be any too familiar to our students, and are conspicuous by their absence at moments when they would naturally be expected.

A typical example of this kind is the use of the preposition 'with' following the verbs 'live', 'leave' and 'stay':

Peter's home is in the country, but while he goes to school he lives in town with his grandmother (aga sel ajal, kui ta käib koolis, elab ta linnas vanaema juures).

Whenever I go to the theatre I have to leave my child with some friends (Kui ma teatrisse lähen, pean lapse tuttavate juurde jätma).

If I can't get a room at a hotel I can stay with my cousin (Kui ma vöörastemajja tuba ei saa, vöin elada onutütre juures).

The same is true of the verb 'remain', which is somewhat more formal or literary than 'stay':

For the rest of the summer she remained with her new friends (Suve lõpuni jäi ta oma uute sõprade juurde).

Instead of the prepositional object preceded by 'with' we can also use the expression 'at a person's (place)':

Peter's home is in the country, but while he goes to school he lives in town at his grandmother's (or: at his grandmother's place).

Whenever I go to the theatre I have to leave my child at a friend's (or: at a friend's place).

If I can't get a room at a hotel I can stay at my cousin's (or: at my cousin's place).



### I37. 'To work'

Another case in point is the verb 'work', which should be followed by the preposition 'for' when we wish to indicate the employer:

In his childhood he had worked as a herdsboy for a big farmer (Lapsepõlves oli ta suurtaluniku juures karjuseks olnud).

The man worked as a travelling salesman for a big firm of vacuum cleaners (Mees töötas ühe tolmuimejate firma juures kaubareisijana).

### I38. Newspapers

And lastly the word 'juures' is also used in Estonian in such expressions as 'ajalehe juures töötama', etc. Here the correct English preposition is 'on':

Shortly after she got a job on the local newspaper (Veidi hiljem sai ta tööd kohaliku ajalehe juures).

After the war he worked for sometime on the 'Daily Worker' (Pärast sõda töötas ta mõnda aega ajalehe 'Daily Worker' juures).

### I39. 'For' expressing purpose

We all know the expressions 'to look' or 'search for something', but it seldom seems to occur to us that the preposition 'for' is still necessary when the verb is extended by an adverb (e.g. to look round, or about), or followed by both a direct and an indirect object (e.g. 'searched the whole room for the book). Moreover it can also be used with other verbs implying the same or a similar idea, such as 'to listen', 'to grope', 'to feel', etc.:

The soldier looked around for a sign of the enemy (Sõldur vaatas ringi, kas kuskil pole näha märki vaenlasest).

I searched all my pockets for the ticket, but couldn't find it (Ma otsisin kõik taskud läbi, et pi-  
letit leida).

At every sound of approaching footsteps I pricked up my ears and listened for a knock at the door (ja kuulatasin, kas uksele koputatakse).

It was pitch dark in the hall and we had to grape for the door (me pidime ringi kobama, et ust leida).

We combed the whole wood for them (Me kammisime kogu metsa läbi, et neid leida).

They ransacked the cottage for something to eat or drink, but found nothing (Nad otsisid kogu maja läbi, et midagi söödavat või joodavat leida).

Suddenly the room was plunged into darkness and she felt along the wall for the electric light switch (Ta kohas mööda seina, et leida elektrilüliti).

#### I40. 'To go in', 'to look in', etc.

Students are often not quite sure as to what preposition they should use with the **expression** 'look in' when this is followed by an adverbial phrase. The correct preposition in such cases is 'at':

Look in at my place whenever you happen to be passing by (Vaadake meile sisse, astuge meie poole sisse).

This is also true of the colloquial expression 'to drop in', which requires 'at', not 'to', as many students seem to think:

On my way home I dropped in at the shoemaker's and the bookshop (Koduteel astusin läbi kingsepa juurest ja raamatukauplusest).

The more formal verbs 'to go in' or 'out', 'come in' or 'put', 'enter', 'leave' etc. may be followed by a variety

of prepositions ('at', 'by', 'through' etc.):

They left by the back gate (Nad lahkusid tagavä-  
ravast, tagavärava kaudu).

He went in at the front door (Ta läks sisse ees-  
uksest).

The thief entered by the basement window and  
made his escape through the side door leading into  
the yard (Varas tuli sisse keldri aknast (keldri  
akna kaudu) ja põgenes kõrvaluksest (kõrvalukse  
kaudu), kust pääses õue).



## PARTICLES AND CONJUNCTIONS

### Particles

#### 141. 'Yes' or 'no'?

In Estonian it is very common to answer a negative statement or question by a negative sentence introduced by the affirmative particle 'jah', which is meant to confirm or emphasise the negation. E.g.:

"Nii et te siis ei tea tema aadressi? - "Jah, ei tea".

or: "Kui Eric ei tule õigeaks ajaks koju, me ei saa teda loomaaeda kaasa võtta". - "Jah, ei saa".

When some Estonian students try to express such ideas in English, they invariably say "Yes, I don't" and "Yes, we won't". But in English a negative statement can only be preceded by a negative particle. Thus the correct English equivalents for the above-mentioned Estonian examples would be:

"So you don't know his address?" - "No, I don't".  
and: "If Eric doesn't get home in time, we won't be able to take him to the zoo with us". - "No, we won't".

If we wish to stress the idea of agreement or confirmation, we might say:

That's right, we won't.

But on no account can we say:

Yes, we won't.

#### I42. 'No' or 'not' in a negative answer?

A surprising mistake, which occurs more often than might be expected, is the use of 'not' instead of 'no' as an answer to a question, e.g.:

Do you know him? - Not. (or even:) Not, I don't.

This is absolutely wrong. The negative form of 'yes' is 'no':

Do you know him? - No, I don't.

Did they tell you about it? - No, they didn't.

However it should be borne in mind that 'not' may be freely used in combination with a noun, pronoun, or prepositional phrase, etc., in emphatic elliptical answers, especially in conversational style:

Wouldn't you like to ask him? - Not me. (Mina küll mitte)

Can you imagine taking a risk like that? - Not on your life. (Mitte, elu seeski.)

Can't I come too, Mummy? - Not this time, dear, (Seekord mitte), etc.

#### I43. 'No' or 'not' with nouns and verbs

When we have to choose between 'no' and 'not' inside a sentence we should remember that 'not' is the particle that is used to build the negative forms of verbs and 'no' is used with nouns:

I have not seen him.

I have no money about me.

He did not do that.

He did no harm.

In the case of the verb 'be' both 'no' and 'not' are possible, depending on whether we stress the negation of

the verb or the noun. When we say

He is not a fool,

we use 'not' because we negate the verb as though in contradiction to some statement or suggestion to the effect that he is a fool. In Estonian we might say here:

Rumal ta küll ei ole.

On the other hand, when it is the noun that is negated, 'no' is necessary:

He is no fool.

Here we mean that he is anything but a fool. This might be rendered in Estonian:

Ta pole mingi lollpea; Ta pole põrmugi rumal.

Here are a few more examples:

I beg your pardon, but I'm not a musician, I am an architect (Vabandage, kuid ma pole muusik, olen arhitekt).

I'm no musician, I only strum for my own amusement (Ega ma pole mingi muusik, klimberdan ainult oma lõbuka).

Finally it turned out that the man was not a murderer after all (Lõpuks osutus, et mees ei olnudki mõrvar).

Don't stare at me like that, I'm no murderer (Mis sa vahid mind niimoodi, ma pole mingi mõrtsukas).

## C o n j u n c t i o n s

### Copulative conjunctions

#### 144. 'And' and 'or'

Next I should like to draw your attention to certain



mistakes that are often made in the use of the conjunctions 'and' and 'or'.

On the whole, affirmative sentences do not offer any particular difficulty. Here the conjunctions in English and Estonian coincide. Thus we say:

I was sure I'd recognize my fellow-students at once and find the right lorry (Olin kindel, et tunnen kaasüliõpilased kohe ära ja leian üles õige auto).

Our guest told us a number of interesting and unusual things (Külaline jutustas meile palju huvitavaid ja ebatavalist).

The explorers returned with fame and riches (Maa-deurijad tulid tagasi kuulsuse ja rikkusega).

But when we wish to make these sentences negative the only correct conjunction in English is 'or'. In Estonian we sometimes preserve the affirmative conjunction 'ja' and sometimes use the conjunction 'ega', which is used in negative sentences and can be regarded as a more or less direct counterpart of the English 'or' in similar construction. Thus it might seem logical to expect 'or' in English where in Estonian we should say 'ega', and the listener may be excused for doubting whether there is any need for a special explanation at all. But curiously enough, I have hardly come across a student who has succeeded in avoiding this mistake until it has been specifically pointed out to him. Here, then, are the negative forms of the above examples together with their Estonian translations. Above all, please note that in English the conjunction is invariably 'or':

I was afraid I wouldn't recognise my fellow-students or find the right lorry (Kartsin, et ma ei tunne kaasüliõpilasi ära ja ei leia üles õiget autot; or: Kartsin, et ma ei tunne kaasüliõpilasi

4 Ära ega leia üles õiget autot);

Our guest could not tell us anything interesting or unusual (Kõlaline ei osanud meile jutustada midagi huvitavat ega ebatavalist);

The explorers returned without fame or riches (Maadeuurijad tulid tagasi kuulsuseta ja rikkuseta).

Of course, we might also say:

They returned with neither fame nor riches,  
which would be the negative form of

They returned with both fame and riches.

#### I45. 'And' and 'or' in enumeration

Another point I should like to make concerning the conjunctions 'and' and 'or' is that it is usually regarded as necessary to insert them in front of the last member of a series, or the last item in an enumeration, if no special stylistic effect is aimed at. This is particularly true in cases where a verb happens to follow. For instance:

A great number of books, articles and manuscripts have been used in compiling this work (Selle töö koostamisel on kasutatud suurt hulka raamatuid, artikleid ja käsikirju).

In the Estonian variant it would be possible to leave out the conjunction 'ja', since the enumeration stands at the end of the sentence:

Selle töö kirjutamisel on kasutatud suurt hulka raamatuid, artikleid, käsikirju.

But it would be bad English to omit the conjunction 'and' and say:

A great number of books, articles, manuscripts have been utilised in compiling this work.

since the enumeration is directly followed by the verb.

The same would apply to the conjunction 'or' if we were to turn the sentence into its negative form:

No books, articles or manuscripts have been utilised in compiling this work (Selle t55 koostamisel pole kasutatud raamatuid, artikleid ega käsikirju; or simply; Selle t55 koostamisel pole kasutatud raamatuid artikleid, käsikirju).

It would be quite wrong to leave out the 'or' and say "No books, articles, manuscripts have been utilised...". Unfortunately, quite a number of our students seem to have made a habit of omitting the conjunction in such enumerations, with regrettable results to the quality of their style. My advice is to take care to insert the conjunctions 'and' and 'or' in all ordinary enumerations, and to regard their omission as a special device which should only be brought into play on certain occasions, when we are deliberately aiming at a specific stylistic effect.

#### 146. The conjunction with nouns occurring in pairs

Another case where Estonians tend to omit the conjunction on the model of their native language is in sentences like

Teil ei tule kaua oodata, ainult kolm-neli minutit;

or: Me kõik olime umbes kuue-seitsmeteistkümnenaastased tüdrukud.

In English, or at least in standard British usage, it is impossible to say 'three-four minutes' or 'girls of sixteen-seventeen'; and we should always insert the con-



conjunction 'or' between the two numerals:

You won't have to wait long, only three or four minutes;

and: We were all girls of about sixteen or seventeen.

This applies to all sorts of pairs, and words that are commonly associated with each other. In Estonian there is no harm in saying:

Poisid-tüdrukud läksid käsikäes;

Pane noad-kahvlid lauale;

Bussid-trammid olid rahvast täis, etc. etc.

But the 'and' can certainly not be omitted in such English sentences as:

Boys and girls went hand in hand.

Put the knives and forks on the table.

The trams and buses were crowded, etc.

#### I47. 'And' in numerals

Perhaps few of our students would actually make a mistake in such cases, but quite a number might hesitate before making up their minds. And there are still one or two of them who need to be reminded from time to time of the simple rule that the word 'hundred' is invariably followed by 'and' in compound numerals:

I33 (a hundred and thirty-three);

6,666,666 (six million six hundred and sixty-six thousand, six hundred and sixty-six).

True, colloquial American appears to be somewhat less consistent in this respect, and we find some of Hemingway's characters remarking 'four hundred twenty' and 'two hundred five'. But these constructions sound illiterate in any normal context, and we should never use them

ourselves.

Naturally, the 'and' disappears together with the 'hundred' when the latter is dropped, as it often is in the curt, businesslike manner adopted in discussion or at work:

That makes a total of 4446 (four thousand four forty-six);

Turn to page 323 (three twenty-three), etc.

#### I48. 'Both...and'

While the copulative conjunction 'as well as' is fairly popular with our students, its synonym 'both... and' is sadly neglected. And those who use it are often not quite sure exactly where they should place it in the sentence, especially when the word order is complicated by prepositional phrases or compound tenses. The rule is that the constructions following each of the two words should be strictly parallel. Thus we can say equally well: 'Both in the summer and in the winter' (preposition and article repeated) or 'In both summer and winter' (articles omitted, one preposition preceding the whole construction); but we cannot say: 'In both the summer and in winter' etc., where the constructions following the two words are not symmetrical.

Naturally, when we have to combine two phrases with different constructions, we have to conform to the idiom. Thus we say:

He has worked both in town and in the country  
(Ta on tšötamud nii maal kui ka linnas).

But 'in both town and in the country' would be wrong, though there is no objection to the elliptical form: 'in both town and country',

Again we may say:

Machines produced by this plant both have been  
and will be displayed at international fairs;

or more fully:

Machines produced by this plant both have been  
displayed in the past and will continue to be  
displayed in the future at international fairs.

But we must not say: "have both been and will be shown,  
etc." However, if both the verbs are in the same tense,  
we can place both in the middle and omit the second  
auxiliary, as in:

I have both read the book and seen the film,  
where 'have' refers to both verbs ('read' and 'seen').

#### 149. 'Either ... or' and 'neither ... nor'

The same rule calling for a strictly parallel  
construction after both words is valid in case of the  
companion pairs 'either ... or' and 'neither ... nor'.  
Thus we should say:

He promised to come on either Monday or Tuesday,  
or He promised to come either on Monday or on  
Tuesday.

She ought to have arrived long ago. Either she  
must have fallen ill or she must have missed her  
train;  
or She must have either fallen ill or missed her  
train;

But it is better not to be too pedantic when we are  
dealing with compound tenses, and while the correct form



would be:

She must either have fallen ill or have missed  
her train,

there can be little objection to the shorter form:

She must either have fallen ill or missed her  
train.

This is not strictly parallel, but it is simpler and would  
sound quite natural in spoken English.

Now for a few more examples:

The document had been signed neither by the  
director nor by the secretary;

or The document had been signed by neither the  
director nor the secretary.

We couldn't find Willy anywhere. He was neither  
working in his room nor digging in the garden;

or He was neither in his room nor in the garden.

### Conjunctions of time and comparison

#### I50. 'If' or 'when'?

A pair of conjunctions frequently confused by our students are 'if' and 'when', which are both translated by the Estonian 'kui'. The distinction to remember here is that 'when' refers to time (siis kui, sel ajal kui), whereas 'if' expresses condition (sel juhul kui). E.g.:

When the weather is fine I can stroll round the town for hours looking at the crowd (Siis kui ilm on ilus, i.e. ilusa ilmaga võin ma tundide kaupa mööda linna jalutada ja rahvast vaadelda);

and: When it rains it's nice to sit in the café (Siis kui, i.e. sel ajal kui sajab, on mõnus kohvikus

istuda).

In both of these examples we use 'when' because the meaning is temporal. But often we only need to make a slight change in order to turn the same sentence into one expressing condition. Thus:

If the weather is fine I shall stroll round the town, but if it rains I shall sit in the café (Juhul kui ilm on ilus, jalutan linnas ringi, aga juhul kui sajab, istun kohvikus).

This close similarity between sentences expressing time and condition often gives rise to perplexity and leads to mistakes in one direction or the other: some students preferring 'when' while others tend to overwork 'if'. But really it should not be so difficult to choose the right conjunction. Most of us usually know well enough whether we wish to express time or condition. Certainly there is little excuse for hesitation in sentences like

If you say so, nobody will believe you (Juhul kui te seda ütlete, keegi ei usu teid, which can only express condition),

or When the baby is ill, the whole family is worried (Siis kui laps on haige, on terve perekond mures, which clearly refers to time).

Nevertheless some people still succeed in muddling; them up every now and again. And indeed it must be admitted that in a few instances either meaning may be implied, or even a sort of vague compromise between the two. This has given rise to the mixed formula 'if and when' which Fowler so strongly condemns in his "Modern English Usage".

Sometimes, though much less frequently, the conjunction 'as' is mistakenly used instead of 'when' or 'if'.

Thus we can say:

If we compare the two forms, we shall see that the level of the pupil's knowledge is slightly higher in Form B (Kui me võrdleme neid kaht klassi, i.e. neid kaht klassi võrreldes näeme, et b-klassi õpilaste tase on pisut kõrgem);

or When the term is over you must take a nice, long rest (Kui semester saab läbi, peate ilusasti kaua puhkama);

But we cannot say: As we compare the two forms ...' or 'As the term is over'.

#### I51. 'As'

On the other hand, Estonians very seldom use the conjunction 'as' in its correct temporal meaning to indicate that two actions are going on parallel to each other. For instance:

As we drove along the guide pointed out to us the sights of the town (Sel ajal kui me sõitsime, juhtis giid meie tähelepanu linna vaatamisväärsustele);

or: As I looked through the article I became more and more interested in the problem (Artiklit lugedes hakkasin probleemi vastu üha enam huvi tundma, i.e. sedamööda, kuidas or siis kui ma artiklit lugesin).

Of course, it is also possible to use 'when' in such sentences, but the meaning is then different, for 'when' expresses not a parallel, but a successive action.

#### I52. 'As' or 'like'?

Students frequently hesitate when they have to choose between 'as' and 'like' to express the Estonian idea 'nagu'. The basic rule here is simple enough, although even uneducated English people are liable



to make mistakes. The preposition 'like' refers to a noun or pronoun, whereas the conjunction 'as' introduces a clause:

You behaved like a child.

You behaved as only a child would have done.

or: Now you speak like my mother.

Now you speak exactly as my mother does.

### I53. 'Then'

Attention should also be drawn to the much too frequent use by Estonian students of the word 'then' in clauses of condition. In Estonian we are in the habit of inserting the conjunction 'siis' almost indiscriminately. E.g.:

Kui ta on haige, siis ta ei tule.

Kui te peaksite Aleksit kohtama, siis tervitage teda minu poolt, etc.,

although it would by no means be wrong to leave out the word 'siis' and simply say:

Kui ta on haige, ta ei tule;

or Kui te peaksite Aleksit kohtama, tervitage teda minu poolt.

Following the Estonian model in their minds many of our students invariably use the conjunction 'then' in corresponding English sentences and say:

If he is ill, then he won't come  
instead of If he is ill, he won't come;

or If you should meet Alec, then give him my regards  
instead of If you should meet Alec, give him my regards.

Of course, we cannot say that 'then' is absolutely wrong in English. Occasionally it does occur, if only in long

and complicated sentences. But the exaggerated use of 'then' by Estonians in such short sentences as the example given above is clumsy and unidiomatic. The best rule is to cut it-out altogether, since there is nothing to be gained by it, but much to lose.

#### I54. The superfluous 'where'

Probably under the influence of Estonian, students often use the word 'where' to form a sort of compound conjunction with the adverb 'now'. The correct forms here are 'now that' or less commonly 'now when'. Thus we say:

Now that you know the news, your mind should be at ease (Nüüd kus (or nüüd mil) uudis on teile teada).

Now that the exam is over, it does not seem so awful after all (Nüüd kus (or nüüd mil) eksam on möödas).

In both the above sentences 'now when' is also tolerable, but 'now where' would be a bad mistake.

#### Consecutive conjunctions

#### I55. 'So' or 'therefore'?

'So' and 'therefore' are both consecutive conjunctions having the meaning 'thus', 'for that reason', 'accordingly', 'consequently'. Estonians seem to prefer the second and very seldom use the first. We should remember, however, that 'therefore' is much more formal in style. In a piece of formal argumentation or theoretical writing, or a set speech, it may be entirely in place, but in everyday conversation or a letter to a friend 'so' should be preferred.

A is equal to B; B is equal to C; therefore A is equal to C. (Järelikult (seega) võrdub A C-ga).

On three successive occasions the test has yielded different results; therefore additional, more elaborate, experiments are called for (Seetõttu on veel vaja teha täiendavaid, põhjalikumaid katseid).

It was rather cold and windy, so we decided to put off the outing till the weather was warmer (seetõttu otsustasime väljasõidu edasi lükata).

All the tickets had been sold out, so we came back home empty-handed (niisiis tulime tagasi tühjade kätega).

#### I56. 'That is why'

Whenever the words 'sellepärast' or 'seetõttu' are stressed, especially by coming at the head of a new sentence, they are best translated by the expression 'that is why'. This phrase, so common in normal colloquial English, seems to be all but unknown to the vast majority of our students, who consistently ignore it. Compare the parallel examples following:

The numbers of several bird species are decreasing rapidly. It is therefore imperative to take effective measures to protect them (Seetõttu tuleb rakendada tõhusaid abinõusid nende kaitseks).

The numbers of several bird species were decreasing rapidly. That is why effective measures were taken to protect them (Seetõttu rakendati(gi) tõhusaid abinõusid nende kaitseks).

John is a good-natured chap, so he is naturally invited everywhere (John on heasüdamlik sell, sellepärast teda kutsutaksegi igale poole).

John is a good-natured chap; that is why he is invited everywhere. ((nimelt) selle pärast teda kutsutaksegi igale poole).

Stella has sprained her ankle, so she can't go skating (Stella nihestas jala, seetõttu ta ei saa



uisutama minna).

Stella has sprained her ankle. That is why she can't go skating (Sellepäraat ta ei saagi uisutama minna).

### The conjunctions of cause and reason

In English there are a number of conjunctions that can be used to express cause and reason (for, because, since, as, seeing). In general they are not difficult to use, but most students have no clear idea of the slight differences between them and often pick them at random. So every now and then mistakes are bound to creep in.

The first simple distinction to make is that 'for' and 'because' never occur at the beginning of the sentence, whereas the others may be placed either at the beginning or in the middle.

#### I57. 'For'

The conjunction 'for' is rather formal in style and is rarely used in colloquial speech. It is a co-ordinating conjunction and is used to link two independent clauses:

He felt no fear, for he was a brave man (sest ta oli vapper mees).

Great sums of money are allotted to space flights for the conquest of the cosmos is a problem of great significance for the future of mankind (sest kosmose vallutamine on inimkonna tuleviku seisukohast tähtis probleem).

#### I58. 'Because'

'Because' introduces a subordinate clause and has the same meaning as 'since' and 'as'. It is used in both

colloquial and formal style, but only in the middle of the sentence, never at the beginning; and this is where students often go wrong:

Jenny stayed at home because she had a headache (sest tal oli peavalu).

The girl was afraid of the dog because it barked so loudly (sest et ta haukus nii valjusti)

#### 159. 'Since' and 'as'

'Since' and 'as' are perhaps the most commonly used conjunctions and, as we have seen, they may stand either at the beginning or in the middle of the sentence. On the whole 'since' is slightly more formal or emphatic than 'as'.

In Estonian we often begin the sentence with the subordinate clause, but in English the main clause more often comes first, and the subordinate clause is tacked on almost as a kind of afterthought.

Since we heard about it too late, we could not go to the flower-show;

or in a more conversational manner:

We couldn't go to the flower-show, as we heard about it too late (Et (Kuna) me kuulsime sellest liiga hilja, siis me ei saanud lillenäitusele minna).

Well, let's talk it over tomorrow, since we have no time today (Hea küll, arutame seda asja homme, sest täna pole meil aega).

As (or Since) you didn't wire, we couldn't meet you at the station (Kuna sa ei saatnud telegrammi).

I couldn't ring you up as I'd forgotten your phone number (Ma ei saanud sulle helistada, kuna (sest) olin unustanud su telefoninumbri).

160. 'Seeing'

'Seeing' or 'seeing that' has much the same meaning (kuna, et, arvestades et) but occurs less frequently than 'since' and 'as'; and 'seeing' used alone has perhaps a somewhat American flavour.

Seeing she invited you to her birthday party you ought to do the same (Kuna tema kutsus sind oma sünnipäevale, siis peaksid sina teda ka kutsuma).

All the papers must be handed in by the day after tomorrow seeing that the conference is to begin early next week (kuna (arvestades et) konverents algab järgmise nädala algul)

The conjunctions of concession

There is considerable confusion in the use of the conjunctions of concession (though, although, yet, still, nevertheless, etc.) some of which seem to give rise to uncertainty.

161. 'Nevertheless' or 'though'?

A common, and very bad mistake is that of employing 'nevertheless' instead of 'although' or 'though', e.g.:

They went out nevertheless it was raining;  
or Nevertheless we warned him that the water was cold he insisted on going for a swim in the lake.

This mistake is due to the fact that 'nevertheless' cannot be used to introduce a subordinate clause. It makes no difference which of the clauses comes first in the sentence. The meaning of the conjunction in such cases is always 'in spite of the fact that' (olguigi et, kuigi) and the proper word to use is 'though' or 'although'. Thus the correct English variants of the above examples



are:

They went out though it was raining (Nad lāksid välja, olguigi et sadas);  
and Although we warned him that the water was cold, he insisted on going for a swim in the lake (Olguigi et (kuigi) me teda hoiatasime, et vesi on külm, otsustas ta siiski järve ujuma minna).

On the other hand 'nevertheless' can function either as an adverb or as a co-ordinative conjunction and serves to link two independent sentences. So if we want to use it in the above examples, we must place it at the head of what was originally the main clause and change the order of the clauses so as to get two separate sentences or a compound sentence consisting of two independent statements:

It was raining, nevertheless they went out (Sadas, kuid sellest hoolimata (ikkagi) nad lāksid välja);

We warned him. Nevertheless he decided to go for a swim in the lake (Me küll hoiatasime teda. Siiski otsustas ta minna järve ujuma).

162. 'Though' instead of 'but'

Perhaps we should add at this point that 'though' is freely used in colloquial English as a simple connective word in many cases where the vast majority of Estonian students would automatically say 'but'. Both words will do, but 'though' is usually to be preferred. It is just a shade more idiomatic than 'but' and has the effect of softening the opposition or contrast between the two ideas:

He's a nice boy, though rather slow on the uptake (Ta on kena poiss, aga (or kuigi) kõva peaga).

It's still raining, though not so much as it was

(Ikka veel sajab, aga mitte enam nii kõvasti kui enne).

I enjoyed the lunch all right, though there might have been more of it (Eine maitses hea küll, aga toitu oleks võinud rohkem olla).

The next day we all went on a strenuous, though fascinating, hike through the hills (Järgmisel päeval lāksime māgedess pingutavale ent toredale matkale).

Very often the word 'though' comes later, or it is relegated to the very end of the sentence, which it follows as a sort of afterthought. In such cases it has the meaning of 'all the same':

The dog looks friendly enough. I shouldn't touch it though, if I were you (Aga ma siiski ei puudutaks teda),

It's too cold to go for a stroll. We might try to get a ticket for the circus, though (Aga me võiksime osta tsirkusepileti).

He always breaks something when he washes up. He does his best, though (Aga ta pūūab teha oma parima).

#### 163. 'In spite of the fact that'

Again, many Estonians make the mistake of using the preposition 'in spite of' as a conjunction, attributing to it the meaning of 'although':

In spite of many of the workers were ill with the flu the plant managed to fulfill its monthly plan (Sellest hoolimata et paljud tšõlised olid gripis).

We must remember that a preposition can only modify a noun or a noun-equivalent, - never a whole clause or sentence. But we can get over the difficulty by adding the noun 'fact' and thus converting the phrase into a conjunction:

In spite of the fact that many of the workers were ill with the flu the plant managed to fulfil its monthly plan.

Here are a few more examples:

In spite of the fact that the task was very complicated we coped with it successfully (Ülesande keerukusest hoolimata tulime sellega edukalt toime).

The rescue operations involved a terrible risk in spite of the fact that all necessary precautions were taken (Päästetööd olid seotud suure riskiga kõigist ettevaatusabinõudest hoolimata).

In some parts of the world primitive methods of land cultivation still persist in spite of the fact that great progress has been achieved in the mechanisation of agriculture (Hoolimata inimkonna suustest edusammudest põllumajanduse mehhaniseerimisel).

Actually this expression is already regarded by some grammarians as a kind of compound conjunction, although it is not yet registered as such in dictionaries. We might also do well to remember that 'in spite of the fact that' is somewhat more formal and precise than 'although', and consequently less suitable for use in short and simple everyday sentences. In all of the above examples 'although' or 'though' would also have been possible, but they would have had the effect of softening the opposition and making the tone more casual and conversational.

#### 164. 'Yet' and 'still'

'Yet' and 'still' have much the same meaning and function as 'nevertheless', but are less formal and emphatic:

He worked hard, yet failed (Ta töötas küll tublisti, ometi ta kukkus läbi).



Harry is very wilful, yet he's not such a bad boy at heart (Harry on väga kangekaelne, ometi pole ta südame poolest halb pois).).

The teacher explained everything very thoroughly, yet some of the children were still puzzled (siiski mõned õpilased ei saanud ikka veel aru).

The speaker had weighty arguments to prove his point. Still I am not convinced that he was right (Sellest hoolimata ma põle päris veendunud, et tal oli õigus).

He deserves to be punished severely, still I wouldn't be too hard on him just this time (Siiski poleks ma temaga seekord liiga karm).

#### 165. 'As' expressing concession

A useful alternative to 'although' when we wish to express concession in a subordinate clause is 'as'. This is another possibility which Estonians hardly ever make use of. The construction with 'as' is rather emphatic, laying special stress on the predicative. As a result the word order is inverted, and we begin the clause with the predicative, immediately followed by the conjunction 'as':

Tired as he was he was in the best of spirits  
(= Although he was tired ...)

Early as it was the air was already quite warm  
(= Although it was early ...)

Fully clothed as he was, he dived unhesitatingly into the sea (= Although he was fully clothed ...)

I N D E X   I  
Basic problems discussed

- Ablative Case** 35.  
**accidents** 55.  
**Adjectival predicative** 16.  
**adjective** 11, 12.  
**adjective + noun** 12.  
**adverbial clause** 22.  
**adverbial modifier of cause** 5.  
**adverbial modifier of place**  
    35, 37, 45, 62, 63, 80, 84,  
    113, 140.  
**adverbial modifier of time**  
    22, 73, 80, 127.  
**affirmative sentence** 19, 23,  
    144.  
**Allative Case** 46, 48.  
**American English** 2, 5, 8, 87.  
    102, 110, 147, 160.  
**appearance** 135.  
**attribute** 1, 2, 37, 39, 85,  
    98.  
**cause** 5, 38.  
**clause of condition** 153.  
**colloquial style** 8, 11, 26, 72,  
    87, 94, 114, 118, 120, 121,  
    142, 147, 155-158, 162, 163.  
**colour** 129.  
**Comitative Case** 42, 47, 49, 54,  
    68, 97, 104, 108, 111.  
**comparative degree** 3, 4.  
**comparison** 4. 9.  
**compound tense** 148, 149.  
    condition 150.  
    degree 20, 21.  
    direction 37, 41, 45, 73,  
        74.  
    direct object 48, 49, 94,  
        96, 98, 102, 103, 108-  
        110, 112-115, 121, 123,  
        139.  
    diseases 51.  
    distance 75.  
    duration 78, 81.  
**Elative Case** 35, 38, 87,  
    88, 111.  
    emotion 57, 58.  
    emotional colouring 1, 24.  
    emphatic construction 6,  
        22, 33, 142, 159, 164,  
        165.  
    enumeration 21, 145.  
    familiar style 17, 118.  
    formal language 2, 6, 15,  
        72, 114, 118, 120, 121,  
        136, 155, 157-159, 163,  
        164.  
    futurity 78, 82.  
**Genitive Case** 39.  
    gerund 45.  
    Illative Case 36, 112.  
    Indefinite tenses 76.  
    independent clause 157, 161  
    indirect object 114, 139.

Inessive Case 62, 135.  
 infinitive 49, 101, 103.  
 interrogative sentence 19, 23, 24.  
 intransitive verb 49.  
 inversion 22, 165.  
 link-verbs of being and remaining 1, 8.  
 manner 135.  
 negative answer 142.  
 negative form 143.  
 negative idea 18, 23.  
 negative sentence 19, 23, 141, 144.  
 negative-interrogative sentence 19.  
 newspapers 138.  
 noun 143, 152, 163.  
 nouns in pairs 146.  
 numerals 147.  
 order 21, 79.  
 participle 15.  
 Past Indefinite 25.  
 Past Perfect 25, 34.  
 Perfect Continuous tenses 25.  
 Perfect tenses 25, 76.  
 point in time 84.  
 positive sense 18, 23.  
 predicative 1. 2. 5. 15, 165.  
 prepositional phrase 148.  
 Present Indefinite 77.  
 Present Perfect 25, 34, 77.  
 purpose 39, 78, 139.  
 quality 134.  
 quantity 132.  
 repetition 79.  
 size 1.  
 stress 92, 141, 156, 165.  
 subordinate clause 158, 161, 165.  
 superlative degree 3, 4, 14.  
 time of the day 83.  
 time relations 20 150, 151.  
 uneducated speech 5, 152.  
 verb 143, 152.  
 verb + adverb 12.  
 word order 1.



## I N D E X   I I

### English words discussed or mentioned

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>About 92-94. 118. 119. 135.</p> <p>accustomed 47.</p> <p>across 26.</p> <p>admiration 57. 58.</p> <p>affection 57.</p> <p>afraid 16. 71.</p> <p>after 82.</p> <p>against 57. 110.</p> <p>agree 104.</p> <p>alike 16.</p> <p>along 26.</p> <p>already 24. 25.</p> <p>although 161. 163. 165.</p> <p>among 88-90.</p> <p>and 144-147.</p> <p>apologise 50.</p> <p>approach 48.</p> <p>array 130.</p> <p>arrive 113.</p> <p>as (conj.) 150-152. 158-160, 165.</p> <p>as (rel. pron.) 68.</p> <p>as early as 25.</p> <p>as far as 75.</p> <p>as far back as 25.</p> <p>as late as 25.</p> <p>as well as 148.</p> <p>ashamed 16.</p> <p>ask 98. 100. 101.</p> | <p>at 29, 30, 32, 35, 37, 62, 84, 113, 114, 127, 128, 136, 140.</p> <p>at first 21.</p> <p>at last 21.</p> <p>be 34, 84. 143.</p> <p>be bound 41.</p> <p>be introduced 120.</p> <p>be sorry 116.</p> <p>because 158.</p> <p>because of 5.</p> <p>become 1.</p> <p>become acquainted 120.</p> <p>before 50.</p> <p>beginning 127.</p> <p>believe 103.</p> <p>best 13.</p> <p>between 89.</p> <p>book 125.</p> <p>both ... and 144, 148.</p> <p>but 162.</p> <p>by 84, 125, 134, 140.</p> <p>call 114.</p> <p>celebrated 70.</p> <p>characteristic 66.</p> <p>clothe 130.</p> <p>collect 32.</p> <p>comb 139.</p> <p>come 26, 84, 112.</p> |
|---|--|

come in 140..  
come out 140.  
compare 105.  
conceal 32.  
consist 106.  
cover 130.  
cut 40.  
dart 41.  
date back to 25.  
date from 25.  
deal 115.  
demand 99.  
despite 85.  
die 43.  
distance 128.  
down 26.  
down to 74.  
drape 130.  
draw 111.  
dress 130.  
drop in 114, 140.  
due to 5.  
early 67., 80.  
either 19.  
either ... or 149.  
elder 3.  
eldest 3.  
end 127.  
enough 6.  
enter 33, 112, 140.  
enthusiasm 119.  
enthusiastic 118.  
excursion 52.  
expect 99.  
expedition 52.  
expert 117.

fairly 18.  
fall 40.  
famous 70.  
farm 62.  
feel 8, 116, 139.  
feeling 57, 58.  
feel sorry 116.  
first(ly) 21.  
fool 6.  
foolish 6.  
fond 60.  
for (prep.) 39, 41, 56-61,  
67, 70, 71, 78-80, 100,  
116, 119, 137, 139.  
for (conj.) 157.  
forget 31.  
from 35, 38, 39, 43, 76, 87,  
98, 99, 107.  
from among 88.  
gather 32.  
get 113.  
get to know 120.  
go 26, 45, 84.  
go back to 25.  
go in 140.  
go on a tour 123.  
go out 140.  
greatly 15, 16.  
grope 139.  
hail 54.  
hand in 32.  
happen 42.  
hard 10.  
hardly 10.  
hate 126.  
hatred 57, 58.

have pity 57.  
 here 27.  
 hide 32.  
 highly 15, 16.  
 hundred 147.  
 if 150.  
 ill 2.  
 in 29, 30, 32-35, 37, 39,  
     40, 53, 54, 62-64, 81-  
     83, 103, 106, 107, 111,  
     113, 117, 123, 124, 127-  
     132.  
 included 91.  
 including 91.  
 in spite of 85, 86, 163.  
 in spite of the fact that  
     163.  
 interfere 44.  
 in the first (second etc.)  
     place 21.  
 into 29, 33, 36, 40, 44, 112,  
     130.  
 irrespective of 86.  
 jot down 32.  
 journey 52.  
 jump 41.  
 keen 118.  
 know 118.  
 known 70.  
 late 67, 80.  
 like 121, 152.  
 last(ly) 21.  
 later 82.  
 leap 41.  
 leave 30, 31, 136, 140.  
 listen 139.  
 lecture 124.  
 lecturer, 124.  
 little 1.  
 live 136.  
 look 1.  
 look (for) 139.  
 look in 114, 140.  
 love 57, 58, 126.  
 make 41.  
 make a tour 123.  
 make it 113.  
 make sb's acquaintance 120.  
 make sb a present 122.  
 manage 49.  
 map 65.  
 margin 63.  
 marriage 108.  
 marry 108.  
 meet 102.  
 most 13.  
 move 26.  
 much 15.  
 muffle 130.  
 negation + until (till) 22.  
 neither ... nor 144, 149.  
 nevertheless 161, 164.  
 no 141-143.  
 not 142, 143.  
 note down 32.  
 notorious 70.  
 novel 125.  
 now that 154.  
 now when 154.  
 of 39, 43, 56, 58-60, 66, 71,  
     92-94, 98, 99, 106, 118.  
     120-123, 125, 126.



older 3..	rapture 119.
oldest 3.	rapturous 118.
on (adv.) 20, 76.	rather 18.
on (prep.) 29, 35, 46, 52.	reach 113.
57. 62-65. 83. 104. 114.	reason 56.
117, 118, 124, 138.	remain 29, 136.
on account of 5.	remarkable 70.
only 22.	rend 40.
onward(s) 20, 76.	renowned 70.
open 7.	require 99.
oppose 109.	resemblance 121.
or 144-146.	resemble 121.
out of 87, 88..	respect 57.
over (adv.) 26.	result 107.
over (prep.) 93, 118, 119.	round 26.
owing to 5.	run 26.
paint 111.	run back to 25.
painting 64.	rush 41.
pay a call 114.	same 68.
pay attention 46.	say 94, 95.
pay a visit 114.	search 139.
photo 64, 125.	seeing (that) 160.
picnic 52.	set 33.
picture 64, 125.	settle down 47.
pity 57.	shatter 40.
play 125.	sick 2.
poem 125.	since (prep.) 76, 77.
popular 90.	since (conj.) 158-160.
popularity 90.	small 1.
portrait 125.	smell 8.
present 122.	snap 64.
protest 110.	snowstorm 54.
put 33.	so 155, 156.
rain 54..	sound 8.
ranch 62.	speak 93, 97, 118.
ransack 139.	specialist 117.

spring 41.  
stand 8.  
start 41.  
stay 29, 136.  
step 26.  
step in 114.  
still (adv.) 23.  
still (conj.) 164.  
storm 54.  
suffer 43.  
sympathise 116.  
sympathy 61.  
take pity 57.  
talk 93, 96, 97, 118.  
taste 8.  
tear 40.  
thanks to 5.  
that is why 156.  
that's right 141.  
then 21, 153.  
there 27, 28.  
there is - there are 27.  
therefore 155, 156.  
think 92, 93.  
though 161, 162.  
through 140.  
thunderstorm 54.  
till 72.  
time 79.  
to 29, 34, 36, 40-42, 45-  
48, 50, 52, 66, 95, 97,  
104, 105, 108, 109, 113,  
114, 120-122, 140.  
tone 53.  
too 17, 19.  
tour 52, 123.

treat 115.  
tree 63.  
trip 52.  
typical 66.  
until 72.  
up 20, 26.  
upholster 130.  
upon 57.  
up to 73, 74.  
upward(s) 20.  
usual 9.  
usually 9.  
very 15-17.  
very much 15, 16.  
visit 114.  
voice 53.  
voyage 52.  
walk 26.  
want 133.  
weather 54.  
well-known 70.  
when 150, 151.  
where 154.  
with 38, 42, 44, 47, 49, 51,  
53, 61, 68, 69, 90, 97,  
102, 104, 105, 108, 111,  
115, 116, 120, 122, 130,  
133, 136.  
work 137.  
wrap 130.  
write 32, 111.  
yet (adv.) 23, 24.  
yet (conj.) 164.  
yes 141.

# INDEX III

## Estonian words discussed or mentioned

- |                        |                  |
|------------------------|------------------|
| Abielluma 108.         | juhtuma 42.      |
| aga 162..              | juhul kui 150.   |
| alal 117.              | juures 135-138.  |
| alates 20, 76.         | jõudma 113.      |
| alguses 21.            | järelikult 155.  |
| alles 22, 23, 25.      | järgi 134.       |
| arutama 93.            | jätma 30.        |
| arvama 92, 95.         | jaama 29.        |
| arvamusel olema 104.   | ka 19.           |
| arvestades et 160.     | kahju olema 116. |
| avatud 7.              | kaudu 140.       |
| ega 144.               | kaugusel 128.    |
| ei 141. 142.           | kauguses 128.    |
| ei ... ega 149.        | kaupa 132.       |
| ent 162.               | kavatsema 92.    |
| esialgu 21.            | kinkima 122.     |
| esimene, esimesena 21. | kirjutama 111.   |
| esiteks 21.            | kohta 94, 95.    |
| et 160.                | kohtama 102.     |
| haaval 132.            | kohtuma 102.     |
| haige 2.               | kolhoos 62.      |
| halb 2.                | koosnema 106.    |
| harjuma 47.            | kui 150.         |
| hoolimata 85. 86, 163. | kuigi 161, 162.  |
| hulgas(t) 88-90.       | kuna 159, 160.   |
| ikkagi 161.            | kuni 72-75.      |
| ilm 54.                | kõigepealt 21.   |
| ja 144, 145.           | kõvasti 10.      |
| jah 141.               | käsitlema 115.   |
| jooksul 81.            | küllastama 114.  |
| joonistama 111.        | küsima 98.       |
| juba 24. 25.           | lahti(ne) 7.     |



leidma 35.  
liiga 17.  
lugema 35.  
(lõppude) lõpuks 21, 127.  
lähonema 48.  
maalima 111.  
mainima 93, 94.  
mingi 143.  
mõtlemä 92.  
nagu 152.  
nii ... kui ka 148.  
niisiis 155.  
nikerdama 111.  
nõudma 99.  
nõustuma 104.  
nüüd mil 154.  
nüüd kus 154.  
olguigi et 161.  
ometi 164.  
ootama 99.  
ostma 35.  
paluma 100, 101.  
peale 92.  
poolest 131.  
põhjustama 107.  
põhjustatud 5.  
pähe tulema 92.  
pärast 71, 82.  
rahuldama 102.  
rantsõ 62.  
reisid 52.  
rumal 6.  
rääkima 93, 94, 96, 97.  
saadik 76.  
sarnanema 121.  
seal 27, 28.

seas 90.  
seega 155.  
seetõttu 156.  
seisnema 106.  
sel ajal kui 150, 151.  
sellespärast 156.  
sellest hoolimata 161, 164.  
sellest hoolimata et 163.  
sest 157, 158.  
siis 153.  
siiski 161, 164.  
siis kui 150, 151.  
sisse 36.  
sisse astuma 140.  
sovhoos 62.  
tahtma 133.  
talü 62.  
tavaliselt 9.  
tingitud 5.  
toime tulema 49.  
tulonema 107.  
tutvuma 120.  
tõttu 5.  
tähelepanu osutama 46.  
tänu 5.  
unustama 31.  
uskuma 103.  
vaatamata 86.  
vabandama 50.  
vaevalt 10.  
vahel 89.  
(vahele) segama 44.  
vastu 57.  
vastu olema 109.  
veel 23.  
viimaks 21.

viimane, viimasena 21.

viisi 132.

vāga 15.

vāike 1.

õnnetus (juhtum) 55.

ütleva 94, 95.

## SOURCES USED

- Box, Kathleen, *Idiomatic English, A Book for Foreign Students*, London 1955.
- Fowler, H. W., *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, Oxford 1965.
- Fowler, H. W. Fowler, F. G., *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*. London 1956.
- Hornby, A. S., Gatenby, E. V., Wakefield, H., *The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, London 1958.
- Hornby, A. S., *Konstruktsii i oborotô sovremennogo anglijskogo jazôka*. Moskva 1958.
- Kierzek, John M., Gibson, Walker., *The Macmillan Handbook of English*. New York 1964.
- Kivimägi, L., Mutt, O., Silvet, J., Hone, L., *Inglise keele grammatika*, Tallinn 1968.
- Pronichev, A. I., Jakubovich, F. R., *About some Typical Mistakes of Russians in English*. "Inostrannôje jazôki v škole", 1935 № 3.
- Vinocurova, L., *Difficulties of English for Russians*, Leningrad 1948.
- West, Michael, Kimber, P. F., *Deskbook of Correct English*, Leningrad 1963.



Hind 35 kop.